



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 6, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of life and light, our glad hearts thrill at the risen glory of the awakening earth robed in the blooming garb of spring. We are grateful for the mystic wonder of this yearly miracle, as the world is turning green again and Nature climbs to a soul in leaf and flower.

May our ears be atuned to the voices in blossoming boughs, speaking still as they did to Thy servant of old who found tongues in trees declaring "God will surely hasten His word, to keep it. He will not faint nor be discouraged until He hath set justice in the earth." May the tinted branches be to us a parable of Thy faithfulness and Thy constancy, reminding us that even the tomb of winter is but Thy laboratory where spring flowers are being fashioned. So in gloomy days may the gospel of the springtime reassure us that, in our bare and barren winters of despair, where we see but withered leaves, God sees sweet blossoms growing. Thus, from the lowly earth where our weary feet stumble and falter, may the exultant notes of our faith and hope rise like the lark on morning wing, singing its song at heaven's gate. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, April 2, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting and withdrawing nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 223. An act to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior;

S. 224. An act to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased;

S. 319. An act to authorize the acceptance of a permanent loan to the United States by the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, and for other purposes;

S. 427. An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty;

S. 800. An act to authorize certain officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to act as notaries public during the existence of war or a national emergency and 6 months thereafter;

S. 829. An act to amend sections 6 and 11 of the act approved July 24, 1941, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," as amended, to provide for the grade of commodore, and for other purposes;

S. 853. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1909, as amended by the act of January 23, 1942, providing for the sale of naval stores, in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit the sale of naval stores in the continental United States during the war and 6 months thereafter to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and to other persons at stations where purchase from private agencies is found to be impracticable; and

S. 903. An act to amend section 602 (d) (1) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 328. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, because of military operations, to defer or waive payments under nonmineral leases of public lands in Alaska;

H. R. 837. An act to restore and add certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes;

H. R. 905. An act to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in certain land constituting a portion of the tract of land conditionally granted to the county of Los Angeles, State of California, under the act of March 24, 1933, as amended;

H. R. 1037. An act preserving the nationality of a person born in Puerto Rico who resides for 5 years in a foreign state;

H. R. 1201. An act to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration;

H. R. 1202. An act to amend section 36 of the Criminal Code;

H. R. 1284. An act relating to the naturalization of persons not citizens who serve honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war;

H. R. 1397. An act to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument;

H. R. 1680. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge;

H. R. 1857. An act to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy;

H. R. 1860. An act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2087. An act to provide for the punishment of certain hostile acts against the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2281. An act to provide for the issuance of a device in recognition of the services of merchant sailors;

H. R. 2292. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war";

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of the United States in the annual expenses of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee; and

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 886. An act relating to the selective-service deferment, on occupational grounds, of persons employed by the Federal Government;

H. R. 218. An act for the relief of H. F. Mathis;

H. R. 227. An act for the relief of the Tours Apartment Hotel;

H. R. 402. An act for the relief of Frank T. Been;

H. R. 598. An act for the relief of Thelma Cannon McGroary;

H. R. 605. An act for the relief of Shumate Investment Co.;

H. R. 1128. An act for the relief of Bernice James;

H. R. 1131. An act for the relief of the estate of Ola Fowler;

H. R. 1276. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Baldwin, Mattie Baldwin, and Clement B. Baldwin;

H. R. 1279. An act for the relief of Lee Watts;

H. R. 1459. An act for the relief of Albertine Nast;

H. R. 1639. An act for the relief of Frank and Paulina Rublein and Mrs. Ethel Bowers;
H. R. 1691. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the costs of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1724. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost incident to the emergency evacuation of the United States Antarctic Service Expedition's East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2070. An act to effectuate the intent of the Congress as expressed in section 1, paragraph (k) of Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 24, 1942, by adding to the list of institutions named in said paragraph the name of the American Tree Association, an institution similar to the institutions so named.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore [Mr. LUCAS] laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROVISION RELATING TO DEFENSE HOUSING (S. Doc. No. 24)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of a proposed provision continuing the availability of the appropriation "Defense housing," contained in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, until June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A confidential report from the Secretary of War, submitted pursuant to law, relating to the number of land forces personnel under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 in training and service on February 28, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION FOR EMPLOYEES OF GENERAL LAND OFFICE TO ADMINISTER OATHS, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain employees of the General Land Office to administer or take oaths, affirmations, affidavits, or depositions, in the performance of their official duties (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter signed by the chairman and secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, submitting, pursuant to law, a confidential financial report covering operations of the Corporation for the period from its organization on February 2, 1932, to December 31, 1942, inclusive (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ON TRANSFER OF TRAILERS TO MURPHY, N. C.

A letter from the General Manager of the Tennessee Valley Authority, submitting, pursuant to law, a financial report of the Authority in connection with the transfer to the Tennessee Valley Authority from the Farm Security Administration of 100 trailers and a utility building (provided by the Farm Security Administration) from a temporary defense shelter project near Nashville, Tenn., for use at Murphy, N. C., designated by the President as a defense locality, where by reason of national defense activities a housing shortage existed, and also the establishment of auxiliary facilities to house employees engaged at the Hiwassee projects (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War, Navy, and Agriculture (5); and The National Archives (2) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Richard Knaust, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the expansion of activities of the civil affairs section of the Army so as to include a political promotion department to aid in preventing the spread of Communism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter from William H. Leach, publisher of the magazine Church Management, of Cleveland, Ohio, calling special attention to an article entitled "Religion Must Contribute to World Peace"—an open letter to the President and Congress, suggesting and praying that an eminent Christian scholar be intimately connected with the peace parleys after the close of the present wars (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., favoring provision for constructive post-war plans for the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Philadelphia Fur Workers Union, Local No. 53, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that the President's veto of Senate bill 660, the so-called Bankhead farm parity price bill, be sustained; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Whereas the Board of Managers of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers in executive session at Atlanta, Ga., on September 24-27, 1942, representing a membership of 2,685,000 in 48 States, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii, again urges that immediate steps be taken to guarantee budget and authority to the proper agency for uniform registration and identification of all children; and

"Whereas no national step has been taken; and

"Whereas the State of Washington is in a critical location, the parents and educators feel apprehensive of imminent danger to their children; and

"Whereas many communities large and small have requested action to provide this protective measure in a uniform system; and

"Whereas every effort has been made to secure a priority rating on a suitable non-combustible, noncorrosive metal without avail; and

"Whereas certain war industries have offered quantities of scrap material suitable and highly desirable for this vitally necessary protective measure; and

"Whereas the return of this scrap material 'to source' does not yield itself to more constructive material for war production; and

"Whereas we feel that there is a definite need for a precautionary measure to assure our parents and children that every step has been taken to keep the family together in case of disaster, bombing, or evacuation, by means of registration, identification, and fingerprinting; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Washington does hereby respectfully petition the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States and particularly the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State, to do everything possible to secure a priority rating for this scrap aluminum material, that will make suitable identification tags for the children of the State of Washington, at a reasonable price; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact into law S. 207, known as the Nye bill, providing for waiver of second-class postal fees upon resumption of publication by newspapers that were compelled to suspend publication because of war conditions

"Whereas numerous newspapers throughout the Nation and particularly those in towns in smaller communities have been and in the future will be compelled to suspend publication because of the economic conditions and the loss of manpower brought about by the war emergency; and

"Whereas the country newspaper is a valuable economic and social asset in the community life of the Nation and should therefore be encouraged; and

"Whereas newspapers of Minnesota, as those in the Nation, have made great contributions to the war effort through the medium of news articles and advertisements bearing upon the successful prosecution of the war, said contributions in the aggregate being many millions of dollars: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the house of representatives concurring), That we memorialize, petition, and urge Congress to take such steps as are necessary to enact into law S. 207, known as the Nye bill, which provides for the waiver of second-class postal fees upon resumption of publication by newspapers which were compelled to suspend publication during the war and because of war conditions; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota."

HAROLD E. STASSEN,

Governor of the State of Minnesota.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution T

"Whereas during the drought years in the State of North Dakota, when Federal authorities were of the opinion that certain lands of this State were submarginal lands, and unfit for farming purposes; the United States Government created various game reserves and refuges in this State, including in such reserves, some of the land classified as submarginal, and also some of the best

farming land in the State of North Dakota; and

"Whereas the creation of such game reserves took many thousands of acres of lands from the tax rolls of the State, thereby financially crippling the governmental subdivisions in which such lands are located; and

"Whereas the creation of such game reserves has brought about a great increase in the number of migratory waterfowl as well as predatory animals, such birds causing great and an untold amount of damage by the destruction of grain crops of farmers for miles around such game refuges, such damage running into thousands of dollars annually; and the damage caused by such predatory animals to poultry and livestock being enormous; and

"Whereas the Government is in the process of taking additional land for purposes of extending the number and the size of game refuges in the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein). That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully urged to abandon any action for the further acquisition of land and the extension of game refuges in the State of North Dakota; that the Congress enact appropriate legislation to provide for the making of certain payments in lieu of taxes to the taxing subdivisions of the State in which such refuges are located, or in the event that this cannot be done, to provide for the return of such lands to private ownership; that Congress pass appropriate legislation to provide for the filing and the payment of claims by landowners in the locality of such game refuges, whose crops have been destroyed by the large number of migratory waterfowl and predatory animals found on such reserves; be it further

Resolved. That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Interior."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate concurrent resolution

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for extension of the present period of coverage of war damage insurance now in force and a lowering of the rates on war damage policies hereafter issued

"Whereas the premiums charged for war damage insurance already issued have proven to be far in excess of the rate that should have been charged in the light of actual experience; and

"Whereas such policyholders in the continental United States have been charged premiums which have been proven to be far higher than needed for the coverage during the period of the policy; and

"Whereas it is only fair and equitable that lower premiums be charged on policies hereafter issued and that an extension of the period of coverage be given to those who have already paid such high premiums for present coverage: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the house of assembly concurring):

"1. The Legislature of the State of New Jersey respectfully petitions and urges the Congress of the United States to provide for a lowering of the rates to be charged for war damage insurance on policies to be issued in the future and to provide an extension of the period of coverage on policies already issued so that the premiums on future policies and the period of coverage on present policies shall reasonably reflect the low loss experience.

"2. The secretary of the senate is directed to forward properly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Jersey in Congress, and the Chairman of the War Damage Corporation."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate concurrent resolution

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress against the construction of a proposed Bordentown-Sayreville ship canal

"Whereas the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors has passed a resolution authorizing the construction of a ship canal between Bordentown and Sayreville in the State of New Jersey; and

"Whereas the cost of the construction of such ship canal is estimated at \$185,000,000; and

"Whereas the minimum estimate of time required for the construction of such canal is 3 years; and

"Whereas such construction will require a diversion of much strategic war materials; and

"Whereas the proposal includes a requirement that the State of New Jersey provide rights-of-way and bridges which will entail expenditures of several million dollars by this State; and

"Whereas the operation of such canal would entail a tremendous draught on the water supply sources of the State of New Jersey which will seriously endanger the health and safety of the people of the State of New Jersey: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the house of assembly concurring):

"1. The Legislature of the State of New Jersey respectfully petitions and urges the Congress of the United States to refuse to approve any proposal for the construction of a ship canal between Bordentown and Sayreville in the State of New Jersey.

"2. The secretary of the senate is directed to forward properly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Jersey in Congress and the chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress to take action necessary to effect the retirement of the Federal Government from the field of a tax on gasoline

"Whereas the Federal Government in the levying of a tax on gasoline has invaded a field of taxation heretofore exclusively reserved to the States; and

"Whereas there has never been any direct relationship between such Federal taxes and Federal aid to the States for highway purposes; and

"Whereas it appears that normal Federal aid for highways may not be continued beyond the end of the present fiscal year; and

"Whereas gasoline rationing has drastically and seriously reduced State revenue for highway purposes; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has sources of revenue not available to the States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the House of Assembly concurring):

"1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized and requested to take action

necessary to effect the retirement of the Federal Government from the field of a tax on gasoline.

"2. The secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this concurrent resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Immigration:

"Whereas the demonstration of loyalty to the Government of the United States by the residents of the United States of Italian origin has been noteworthy; and

"Whereas this exemplary conduct on those numbers of our population of Italian origin—on the part of those who had not become citizens, as well as those who had perfected United States citizenship—has been deemed worthy of praise by the Attorney General of the United States; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the legislature that, notwithstanding the recent expressions of the Attorney General of the United States, considerable obstacles and delay appear to prevent these worthy residents of our country from finally perfecting their United States citizenship during the existence of a state of war between the United States and Italy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur). That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, respectfully memorialized to take appropriate action to eliminate any delay in the final attainment of citizenship on the part of applicants of Italian origin who have demonstrated themselves to be loyal and worthy, notwithstanding the existence of a state of war between the United States and Italy; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur). That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of Labor of the United States, and to each Member of the United States Senate and each Member of the House of Representatives elected from the State of New York."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Jennings, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GUFFEY (for himself and Mr. DAVIS):

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Resolution 35

"The scarcity of farm labor is threatening the production of foodstuffs necessary to the successful prosecution of the war.

"The greater need of the armed forces for the youth of this Nation has deprived the farm of the labor required to seed and plant and cultivate and harvest the crops required to feed the Nation and our allies.

"There are now confined in special camps throughout the Nation a large number of strong and capable men whose help on the farm at this time would be of inestimable help in producing the food that will be so much needed during the months that lie ahead. These men are the conscientious objectors whose scruples against war have kept them out of military service.

"A number of farmers working 72 hours a week receive wages far below those paid in any other employment furthering the ends of the war.

"To utilize the services of these conscientious objectors on the farms of the Nation would assist in the production of food so sorely needed at this time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation consistent with the Constitution of the United States as will be necessary to authorize the use of all utilization of all able-bodied conscientious objectors on the farms of the Nation for the purpose of increasing the production of crops essential to the needs of the people of the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house to the President of the Senate and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Representatives and Senators from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.)

LIMITATION OF THE PRESIDENTIAL TERM—RESOLUTION OF MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in keeping with the immortal spirit of the great Thomas Jefferson, whose anniversary the whole Nation is about to celebrate devotedly, the Michigan State Legislature has just adopted resolutions in the Jeffersonian spirit and dedicated to one of the greatest of all the objectives which Jefferson deemed essential to the preservation of American democracy. It occurs to me that the Congress, as a part of its share in this Jeffersonian celebration, might well dramatize its own fidelity to this basic Jeffersonian tradition by making this great Jeffersonian anniversary the occasion for initiating the Jeffersonian action which the Michigan Legislature seeks. I present and ask that the Michigan legislative petition in the Jeffersonian pattern be read by the clerk and appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 24

Concurrent resolution applying to the Congress of the United States under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution to limit the term of office of the President of the United States by prohibiting any one person from serving for more than two terms of 4 years each

Whereas the Constitution of the United States now contains no limitation on the number of terms which may be served by one person as President; and

Whereas the sound traditional limitation of two terms for any one person, first suggested and subscribed to by George Washington, has been adhered to by all Presidents from the creation of the United States until the year 1940; and

Whereas the wisdom of the traditional limitation has been amply demonstrated to the people of the United States by the first breach thereof; and

Whereas the tradition should be translated into a positive mandate of the people by action of the States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Michigan Legislature, for the State of Michigan, invokes its power, granted under Article V of the Constitution of the United States, to apply to the Congress of the United States to call a convention of the States for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution to limit the holding of the office of President of the United States by any one person to 2 terms of 4 years each; and be it further

Resolved, That this action of the legislature on behalf of the State of Michigan is a continuing application for the call of a convention for the purpose named herein, and the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to provide by resolution that this application be presented to each succeeding Congress until two-thirds of the States have made similar application; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and all Members of the Michigan delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in order to complete this brief Jeffersonian ritual this morning, I here wish to read one sentence from Jefferson's famous letter to Mr. Weaver in June 1807:

If some period be not fixed, either by the Constitution or by practice, to the services of the First Magistrate, his office, though nominally elective, will, in fact, be for life; and that will soon degenerate into an inheritance.

Mr. President, in these days it is very good to have the country remember Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. In what year was the quotation written?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It was written in 1807.

Mr. GUFFEY. There are many quotations bearing on the same subject of later date than that cited by the Senator from Michigan which he may find by obtaining access to the Jeffersonian Encyclopedia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am very glad to have the Senator's advice. He has run out on Thomas Jefferson so often that I am not surprised that he does so again this morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution of the Michigan Legislature will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

RESOLUTIONS OF THE ILLINOIS LEGISLATURE—FARM AND FARM LABOR NEEDS—ALLOCATION OF WAR CONTRACTS TO CHICAGO PLANTS

Mr. BROOKS. I present for appropriate reference House Joint Resolution No. 21, adopted by the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois, and request unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD. This resolution deals with the food situation, farm

needs, and action of the selective-service board in the drafting of farm labor.

I invite the attention of the Senators to the recommendation of the Illinois General Assembly in this resolution.

I also present for appropriate reference Senate Joint Resolution No. 14, adopted by the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois, and request unanimous consent to have it included following my introduction. This resolution deals with the labor scarcity areas established by the War Manpower Commission. It places the city of Chicago in the labor scarcity area, thereby prohibiting the allocation of additional war contracts to Chicago plants.

I invite the attention of the Members of the Senate to this resolution.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and; under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 21

Whereas it is a matter of the most extreme urgency that our agricultural production resources be maintained at a level which will insure a food supply adequate to meet the extraordinary demands of our armed forces and our civilian population; and

Whereas the imminent food crisis with which this Nation is faced constitutes a grave threat to the successful prosecution of the national war effort; and

Whereas an important contributing factor to this emergency has been the short-sighted selective-service policy which permitted the indiscriminate drafting of essential farm labor; and

Whereas unless this policy is altered immediately to defer or exempt farm labor from military service, we are faced with a complete break down of our internal stability and a consequent impairment of our war effort: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the senate concurring herein), That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact such measures as will immediately defer or exempt from military service all essential farm labor and services for the reasons enumerated in the preamble hereto; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois, and to the War Manpower Commission and the National Selective Service Headquarters at Washington, D. C.

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.)

By Mr. BROOKS:

A joint resolution of the Senate of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 14

"Whereas the War Manpower Commission has classified the city of Chicago and all Illinois cities as a labor scarcity area and placed an immediate ban on the allocation of additional war contracts to Chicago manufacturers; and

"Whereas the significance of Chicago's contribution to the national war effort and the indispensable and vital function it must continue to serve during the pendency of the war cannot be too much emphasized; and

"Whereas the tremendous productive facilities of Chicago, which include the war plants proper, the immediate availability of water and electrical supplies and power, its nearness to vital war materials and natural resources, and its preeminent position as the hub of the greatest railroad, air, and water network of transportation facilities in the world make it imperative that no action be taken which would impair even slightly the magnitude of its contributions; and

"Whereas in addition to the above factors, authoritative statistics disclose that there is no acute labor shortage and a less degree of labor absenteeism in the Chicago war zone than in any other part of the Nation; and

"Whereas the factors which induced the War Manpower Commission to make its ruling should be reconsidered immediately in order to prevent needless and dangerous impairment of the war effort: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That we respectfully urge Hon. Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, to reconsider immediately the order of said Commission banning the allocation of additional war contracts to Chicago and adjacent area for the reasons enumerated in the preamble hereto; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded to Hon. Paul V. McNutt and to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois, to the end that those of the same view may collaborate in their efforts to effectuate the purpose of this resolution."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOLMAN, from the Committee on Immigration:

S. 212. A bill to provide for punishment of persons who escape or attempt to escape from the custody of officers or employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 155).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 2076. A bill to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 156).

By Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. McKellar), from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943; with an amendment (Rept. No. 157).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 961. A bill for the relief of C. A. Ragland, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 962. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan, the Buffalo Insurance Co., and the Miller Insurance Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. Andrews):

S. 963. A bill relating to the imposition of certain penalties and the payment of detention expenses incident to the bringing of certain aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 964. A bill to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 965. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ella W. Hoback; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 966. A bill to provide for the payment in advance of pay and travel allowances to persons in or serving with the military and naval service and to civilian officers and employees in or under the jurisdiction of the War Department or the Navy Department under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DANAHER:

S. 967. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 968. A bill for the relief of the Norfolk Plumbing & Heating Co., and others; to the Committee on Claims.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 323. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, because of military operations, to defer or waive payments under nonmineral leases of public lands in Alaska;

H. R. 837. An act to restore and add certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1397. An act to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 905. An act to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in certain land constituting a portion of the tract of land conditionally granted to the county of Los Angeles, State of California, under the act of March 24, 1933, as amended; and

H. R. 1857. An act to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1037. An act preserving the nationality of a person born in Puerto Rico who resides for 5 years in a foreign state;

H. R. 1284. An act relating to the naturalization of persons not citizens who serve honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war; and

H. R. 1680. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 1201. An act to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration;

H. R. 1202. An act to amend section 36 of the Criminal Code; and

H. R. 2087. An act to provide for the punishment of certain hostile acts against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1860. An act to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes; to the calendar.

H. R. 2281. An act to provide for the issuance of a device in recognition of the services of merchant sailors; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 2292. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war";

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of

the United States in the annual expenses of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee; and

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BONDING FEDERAL OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 26) to provide for the bonding of Federal officials and employees, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. GUFFEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 123), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Mines and Mining, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed \$5,000) to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

AMERICAN - RUSSIAN - BRITISH FRIENDSHIP—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. CHANDLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah at a mass meeting dedicated to the consolidation of American-Russian-British friendship, held at Carnegie Hall, New York City, April 4, 1943, under the auspices of the Committee of Jewish Writers and Artists, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE OBLIGATION OF EVERY AMERICAN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Obligation of Every American," delivered by him at the annual meeting of the Rock County Bar Association at Janesville, Wis., March 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARMY DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY HON. JESSE H. JONES

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, at the Army Day dinner of the Military Order of the World War, held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, on April 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

USE OF ELECTRICITY ON THE FARM—ADDRESS BY VINCENT D. NICHOLSON

[Mr. VAN NUYS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address relating to use of electricity on the farm, delivered by Vincent D. Nicholson, before the annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at St. Louis, Mo., January 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

REHABILITATION OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter addressed to him by Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., relative to the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped, and also a copy of Senate Joint Resolution No. 43, introduced by him on March 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHURCHES CAN END WAR—LETTER BY TOM BURNS

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter written by Tom Burns, of Portland, Oreg., and printed in the Portland Oregonian of April 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED NATIONAL WAR SERVICE ACT—ARTICLE FROM THE WITNESS

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article from the Witness of March 25, 1943, on the subject of a proposed National War Service Act, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED NATIONAL WAR SERVICE ACT—EDITORIAL FROM THE WITNESS

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial from the Witness of March 25, 1943, on the subject of a proposed National War Service Act, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRODUCTION OF RUBBER—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article relating to the production of rubber entitled "How About a Re-count?" written by Frank C. Waldrop and published in the Washington Times-Herald of April 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MANPOWER QUESTION—ARTICLE BY ROBERT L. NORTON

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "All Must Join in To Win War" written by Robert L. Norton and published in the Boston Sunday Post of April 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLICIES FOR THE POST-WAR PERIOD—ARTICLE BY MAJ. GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article relating to policies for the post-war period, by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

BLOW TO ISOLATIONISM—EDITORIAL FROM THE LORAIN (OHIO) JOURNAL

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Blow to Isolationism," published on March 17, 1943, in the Lorain (Ohio) Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

WOMAN'S HOME COMPANION OPINION POLL—AFTER WAR—PEACE?

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a summary of an opinion poll taken by the Woman's Home Companion in April 1943 on the question After War—Peace?, which appears in the Appendix.]

FARM LABOR AND FOOD PRODUCTION—ARTICLE FROM THE MILLER (S. DAK.) GAZETTE

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Farmers Out in Fields for First Time on Thursday," from the Miller (S. Dak.) Gazette of March 25, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PREVENTION OF DEDUCTIONS IN DETERMINING PARITY OR COMPARABLE PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—VETO

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into last Friday, automatically the veto message of the President comes up for consideration, and I understand it is now before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the Chair understands, the agreement was merely informal.

Mr. BARKLEY. If it was only an informal agreement, I should like to have it made formal by asking unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the veto message and the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the Chair lays before the Senate the message from the President of the United States withholding his approval from Senate bill 660.

(For veto message, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, 1943, p. 2828 et seq.)

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 660) to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

INSTRUCTION IN AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, for many years I have been fearful that our schools were failing to teach the youth of the country the true significance of the events which lie behind our Nation's history. I have gained this information from talking to youths of 15 and to middle-aged citizens who are utterly ignorant of the great political events without which no one can understand our national heritage. These persons have shown little knowledge and even little interest concerning the founders and builders of our country, whose aims and ideals we are now attempting to safeguard forever.

It is a well-known fact that State legislatures have been interested in deleting chapters and statements from history books at the insistence of certain powerful groups which are unwilling to have the public know the truth.

A further cause for ignorance lies in the fact that for the past decade or more the enthusiasts of the so-called social science studies have convinced many of our educators that these subjects should be taught in place of history, insisting that social trends rather than real historical events were sufficient for understanding our Nation's history. A few years ago I happened to see a book on civics and social studies which was being widely used in my own city of Pittsburgh, and I was amazed to find the account of a famous society murder trial taking up much space.

What this had to do with training youth along lines of proper conduct I have never been able to comprehend. But it proved that high-school students were being taught such sordid facts rather than the glowing events of our own local history.

We are greatly indebted to the New York Times for the service it has rendered by exposing the lack of proper teaching of history in our schools. At the same time, all of us must feel a deep sense of humiliation to realize that our students are being not only improperly taught, but that this teaching must be due to the exceedingly poor textbooks.

I know that we, as members of the National Legislature, cannot legislate wisely for a people which is being kept ignorant of its own history, in order to close our eyes to facts which might prove inconvenient to the great vested interests, including, of course, the great political interests.

How can we deal with farm legislation if we do not link present emergencies with a long chain of facts stretching back through the First World War, to populism and free silver, to free land and slavery, back to debt and taxes, including facts relative to Shay's rebellion, and beyond?

I might even include in that story a reference to the so-called Whisky Rebellion in my own State, except that I doubt that there are many people, outside a handful of students of history, who understand that the Whisky Rebellion was an armed uprising of Pennsylvania farmers against high and discriminatory taxes. How many of us really know why France helped the American Revolution against England?

How many of us know the part played by the Masonic order in the formation of the Republic.

How many of us know why Thomas Jefferson led the American revolt against Hamilton and the Federalists?

How many of us know the real story of how Nicholas Biddle and the Bank of the United States bought up Members of Congress in the battle when Jackson led the forces for financial freedom?

How many of us know the reason why Abraham Lincoln was attacked so bitterly by his own party, and was only saved from the impeachment which was brought against his Vice President by the fact that he was assassinated?

How many of us know how business stole the country blind in the 1870's, and how or why a Presidential election was stolen in 1876?

We are fighting a war to preserve the freedoms of which the men in the front lines are ignorant. The Army has already taken steps to instruct the soldiers regarding the real meaning of this war. I trust every other branch of the armed forces is doing the same. But again I say, this cannot be properly done without accurate textbooks. This is now a challenge to the educators and textbook writers of this country.

This month we are celebrating the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, and yet, according to the New York Times, a large percentage of the freshmen in 36 colleges

and universities of this country apparently have little idea of the great contribution which Jefferson has made to our Nation and the war.

We cannot preserve our democracy without knowing what lies in our past. In the words of that brilliant patriot of China, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek—

We live in the present, we dream of the future, and we learn eternal truths from the past.

Mr. President, I submit a resolution bearing on this subject, which I ask to have printed at this point in the *RECORD* and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 129) was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as follows:

Whereas recent investigations by nonpartisan and unbiased persons have disclosed an appalling neglect of United States history in our public secondary schools; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States was adopted to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity; and

Whereas this salutary object cannot be achieved in full and sufficient measure unless our children and our children's children possess at least a minimum understanding of the principles that gave this Nation birth and the processes by which it has been maintained since its inception; and

Whereas we are now engaged in a great war testing whether popular government shall endure on this continent or anywhere on earth; and

Whereas this means yielding to our Government in this time of war powers over life and property which are properly denied to it in time of peace; and

Whereas even in the midst of war it is our duty to see that the principles of constitutional government are upheld and that the spirit which animates these principles are kept vital, and that a knowledge of such principles are preserved inviolate for the times of peace; and

Whereas the future welfare of our Nation is utterly dependent on what our children learn; and

Whereas the present astonishing neglect of the history of the United States in our high schools and elementary schools could not have existed without the approval of educational forces directly or indirectly concerned with the direction of the schools; and

Whereas Congress now has before it many proposals to strengthen American secondary and elementary school education; and

Whereas none of these proposals expresses a concern over the woeful status of instruction in the history of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved (a) That the Senate Committee on Education and Labor be instructed to study the ways and means by which the Federal Government may most effectively promote a more thorough study of the history of the United States.

(b) That committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its proceedings, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

(c) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the Senate is sitting, has recessed, or adjourned, and to employ such clerical and other employees, and to have such printing and binding done, as it deems necessary.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the *RECORD* an editorial entitled "It's Time for Americans to Know Their Country," published in the *Philadelphia Record* of April 6, 1943. The editorial bears on the subject matter I have just discussed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

IT'S TIME FOR AMERICANS TO KNOW THEIR COUNTRY

"Of thee I sing."

Yes, we sing of America, most of us fervently, and with genuine love of country in our hearts. But if the survey by the *New York Times*, of 7,000 freshman college students, means anything, a great many of us know almost nothing about those "woods and templed hills" and even less of the history of the "land where my fathers died."

Fifty students believed George Washington was President of the United States in the War of 1812. Only 13 percent knew who was. Twenty-one percent did not know Lincoln was President during the Civil War; 26 percent didn't know Woodrow Wilson was President during the World War.

Most students who answered the American history test, which appears on another page of the *Record* today, had the feeblest notion of what their "native land" looks like. Some put Nebraska, Texas, and Portland, Oreg., on the Atlantic coast. Oregon, Mississippi, Wyoming were listed as among the Thirteen Original Colonies.

Discount some obvious smart-aleck answers in this test, and it is still pretty plain that America has been shameful in neglecting to inform its sons of its own history.

The reason is not hard to find. Last summer the *Times* learned that only 18 percent of our colleges require the study of American history, and only 28 percent of them require credits in American history for admission.

In short, our schools have not done a job.

We do not have to go to the fantastic lengths of nationalism which the totalitarians favor in order to inform American youth on the way their country developed and grew. The present is only an extension of the past—

And it is saddening to think how little some of our supposedly educated youth know of the institutions, ideals, and rights which the United States is now fighting to preserve.

We do not enjoy the rights and material benefits we have through magic or miracle; they are the product of generations of hard work, hard fighting, earnest thought, and great statesmanship.

History as it is taught often seems barren, cold, and unrealistic. Memorizing dates and places without knowing what they mean—in terms of our own lives—can be deadly and futile. And it is true that academicians too often have shouted down such realistic historians as Charles Beard, and too often have made our statesmen seem like statues instead of human beings.

All right, you say: What's to be done about it?

No; we wouldn't pass a law. We would expect, however, that our schools and colleges, without compulsion, begin to teach American history as an essential subject—and teach it well.

We could also require that some basic knowledge of American history be an integral part of civil-service examinations for public offices, State as well as Federal.

But even with all that, you may say, how to teach American history so it will have that meaning which so many students obviously failed to grasp?

We have a suggestion.

Let's start teaching history backwards.

Let's not start from the far past, which seems remote and academic. Let's start from now—and trace, on back, the steps which brought us, as a people, to the proud nationhood which now is ours.

That way we would reach the past naturally. When we got back to the Revolution students might have a broad perspective and background to give it meaning—in terms of the world in which they live.

That way they would discover why it is important today that the Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed back in 1823. They would come to realize that every strong President has had battles with Congress and has been hotly assailed by the press. They would find, against the background of America in 1943, how much it means—to us—that Jackson scotched the Nullification Act, and how important the Homestead Act was in the light of its consequences.

This is just a "hunch" suggestion. But often the unorthodox way is the one which will produce surprising results.

The necessity for more and better teaching of the history of this world's greatest democracy is more imperative now than ever before.

How can we judge the acts of our present Chief Executive, Congress, and the Supreme Court if we have no yardstick with which to measure them?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words concerning the resolution which has just been submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. I think that all other persons who saw the article by Mr. Benjamin Fine, published in the *New York Sunday Times* of April 4, giving the results of a survey taken among 7,000 students in 36 colleges in the United States, must have been greatly shocked at the revelation of the lack of historical and general information possessed by these students. I make this statement, Mr. President, regardless of whether there may be any legitimate criticism by experts on the breadth of the questions, or the selection of subject matter, or the statistical sample involved. Making allowance for every possible explanation or criticism, the fact remains that there is a shocking lack of knowledge of the history of this country, the cultural forces and historical achievements which go to make it the Nation that it is today.

It is particularly significant at a time when we are not only fighting literally for the preservation of this country, but at a time when we must all realize that problems have accumulated, and problems will arise in the future which are calculated to test the survival of the democratic process itself. How can we hope, Mr. President, for a survival of democracy if the educated youths, those who have had the opportunity for education, are ignorant of the basic history of their country? Unless the oncoming generation has some knowledge of United States history we are in grave danger of losing our essential liberties. Some of the young men in these age groups will be required in the near future to lay down their lives for this Government. Others will return from a dozen far-flung battle fronts to face the gravest problems this Nation ever has confronted. How can we expect them to cherish to the full our institutions unless they know how they were established?

Mr. President, I wish to read briefly from this article:

College freshmen throughout the Nation reveal a striking ignorance of even the most elementary aspects of United States history, and know almost nothing about many important phases of this country's growth and development, a survey just completed by the New York Times has shown.

Seven thousand students in 36 colleges and universities in all sections of the country were examined. For the most part these students had taken courses in American history, social studies, or government in high school. Questionnaires were given to the freshmen of the various colleges under the supervision either of the history department or some responsible faculty member.

Few of the students were studying American history in college. The test was designed to determine the amount of United States history that the high-school graduate retains from his secondary course.

One of the conclusions from the present study is that the students are in need of United States history on the college or university level, even though they have taken courses in this field in high school.

More impressive than the lack of knowledge is the amount of misinformation that the survey disclosed.

Mark this, Senators:

A large majority of the college freshmen showed that they had virtually no knowledge of elementary aspects of American history. They could not identify such names as Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, or Theodore Roosevelt, and they had little conception of the significant trends that have made the United States the Nation it is today.

Yet, Mr. President, these youths are upon the threshold of the Selective Service System, and will soon find themselves on the battlefields scattered all over the world fighting for this Nation.

How can we expect to overcome this shocking lack of understanding and appreciation of all the warp and woof that has been woven for 150 or more years to make this Nation what it is today by a few propaganda films and pamphlets prepared under the auspices of the United States Army, effective though those may be? I am not criticizing them; but without the basic knowledge of historical fact and development of this Nation I contend that it is obvious even to a layman such as I, that we cannot with a brief, even though a hot-house type of propaganda or education, overcome this shocking lack of historical knowledge.

I wish to say here, Mr. President, that I do not intend to indict the youth of today. I think this is an indictment of the failure of our educational system to drive this knowledge home in significant enough terms to have it register and remain in the memory of students who have had the opportunity for education. Mind you, we are speaking now of college freshmen. It takes no account of the fact that a large number of persons—no one knows how many—have been rejected for service in the United States armed forces because they are functionally illiterate, which is a euphemistic phrase indicating that they have not had the equivalent of a fourth-grade education.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has it occurred to the Senator from Wisconsin that probably one of the causes for that situation is the trend in modern college life to allow the students a larger discretion as to selective courses, rather than sticking to the old classical courses which were adhered to 40 or 50 years ago? It seems to me that to broaden the selective process and let a student simply study the subjects he wants to study frequently must result in overlooking some of the most valuable and fundamental things in a general education.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think that, so far as the Senator from Wisconsin is concerned, he will have to take refuge by saying that he feels that this is a subject which is worthy the consideration, study, and attention of the Congress and of the Government of the United States. I would not pretend that I am competent, without at least the benefit of a long study, to come to any conclusions with respect to what is responsible for this situation. I certainly would not want offhand to indict what is known as progressive education, or such influence as progressive education has had upon the curricula of our elementary and secondary schools, but I say that here is the result of our school system so far as United States history is concerned. There is something glaringly wrong somewhere when a student who has had the advantage, the priceless privilege of reaching the status of a college freshman in his educational climb up the ladder, lacks, as is indicated by this survey, the knowledge of our history and the events which have made this country great.

The questionnaire was prepared under the supervision of Hugh Russell Fraser, chairman of the committee on American history, and Dr. Allan Nevins, professor of American history at Columbia University.

Mr. President, this is a long article, and I know the Senate wishes to proceed with the business at hand, but I desire to point out a few things which struck me as being startling. I wish to be entirely fair. The article says:

Although it is likely that some of the students were not serious in answering the questions, it is evident, even after discounting that possibility, that the students simply do not know American history.

For example, 1,705 of the 7,000 students, or 25 percent, did not know that Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States during the Civil War.

Mr. President, those students were freshmen college students in 36 colleges in the United States.

The article continues:

Twenty-five students listed George Washington as having been President during that highly important period in American history. Other men listed as having been President during the Civil War included Woodrow Wilson, Ulysses S. Grant, Theodore Roosevelt, William Taft, Herbert Hoover, Andrew Jackson, or Warren G. Harding.

Many students attending southern colleges thought that Jefferson Davis had been President of the United States during the Civil War. Well over 150 college freshmen listed Davis as having been President of this country during that period.

Fifty or more students believed that George Washington was President of the United States during the War of 1812.

As for the Mexican War of 1848, Presidents listed included John Adams, Theodore Roosevelt, Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Thomas Jefferson, and James G. Blaine. More than 40 names are listed by the students of men who were supposed to have been President of this country at one period or another in American history but who never held that office.

Mr. President, I digress to say that most of them probably desired to do so. The article continues:

Evidently the McKinley administration during the Spanish-American War has left little impression upon our students. A little over 1,000 of the 7,000 who answered knew that McKinley had been President. The most common reply was Theodore Roosevelt. Evidently the students did not recognize the fact that Roosevelt came into office after the Spanish-American War.

Moreover, 2,077 students, or 30 percent, did not know that Woodrow Wilson was President of the United States during the last World War.

The men frequently listed as having been President during the last World War were Grover Cleveland, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Warren G. Harding, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt, William McKinley, John Nance Garner, Alf Landon, and Abraham Lincoln. Nearly 100 students thought that Hoover had been President, while 125 listed Coolidge.

I skip a part of the article—

More than 100 students said that Lincoln had caused the Civil War. To others, Lincoln was famous because he had "emaciated"—

E-m-a-c-i-a-t-e-d—

"the slaves," was a great pacifier, prevented union, created a fasting day, and permitted the Negroes to vote. Again, various students said that he was the first President of the United States. One college freshman wrote that Lincoln achieved his fame by heading a reconstruction commission to improve the South after the Civil War ended.

Jefferson, likewise, has attained stature in the eyes of the students by many unhistoric accomplishments. He was, for example, president of the Confederacy, founder of the Saturday Evening Post, a Salvation Army worker, and the originator of the Monroe Doctrine. One student wrote that he was a farmer who bought the West with cash. Thirty or more thought that Jefferson earned his right to immortal fame by discovering electricity.

Evidently Andrew Jackson, despite his place in history, is one of our obscure Presidents. Nearly 50 percent of the students listed him as the famous "Stonewall" Jackson of the Civil War. Others thought he was a "common man," that he instituted the "big stick" policy, and was the father of the United States Constitution.

He is also listed as being a trust buster, of having initiated the Monroe Doctrine, of freeing the slaves, of solidifying the Union, of being a hero in the Spanish-American War of 1898, of taking Texas by force, and of being the first President to be impeached.

Mr. CONNALLY. Who was said to have taken Texas by force?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Some of the students were laboring under the misapprehension that Andrew Jackson had done so.

Mr. WILEY. It "ain't been took" yet.

Mr. CONNALLY. It has been taken by force several times since. [Laughter.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I read further from the article:

Although Theodore Roosevelt's name is important in American history, 81 percent of the college freshmen could not cite two contributions that he had made. However, they did credit him with many obscure and fallacious contributions. Several hundred students said that he was the founder of the National Recovery Administration, the Work Projects Administration, and various other New Deal agencies.

One student wrote that Roosevelt was famous in American life because "he showed that an invalid is not lost." Another said that he "walked on a big stick with a soft voice."

Mr. President, let me come to some of the more statistical data. One of the questions asked was:

On what principal body of water are the following cities located: Cleveland?

Of course, the correct answer is "Lake Erie." The number of students responding correctly was 1,465, or only 21 percent of those who answered.

They were also asked to name the home State of a number of our most famous figures in history. The correct answers varied all the way from being 1 percent to 21 percent of the total number. Twenty-one percent was the highest percentage correct.

Mr. President, I shall not take more time of the Senate in this connection, although I think the subject is of extreme importance. I believe that the resolution submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania should have early and earnest consideration on the part of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. I believe Hugh Russell Fraser and Dr. Allan Nevins have rendered a great service to our country in conducting this survey. I think that the New York Times should be given great credit for having given the results of the survey wide circulation.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed as a part of my remarks the articles on the general subject appearing in the New York Times of April 4 and in the New York Times of April 5.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 4, 1943]
IGNORANCE OF UNITED STATES HISTORY SHOWN BY COLLEGE FRESHMEN—SURVEY OF 7,000 STUDENTS IN 36 INSTITUTIONS DISCLOSES VAST FUND OF MISINFORMATION ON MANY BASIC FACTS

(By Benjamin Fine)

College freshmen throughout the Nation reveal a striking ignorance of even the most elementary aspects of United States history, and know almost nothing about many important phases of this country's growth and development, a survey just completed by the New York Times has shown.

Seven thousand students in 36 colleges and universities in all sections of the country were examined. For the most part these students had taken courses in American history, social studies or government in high school. Questionnaires were given to the freshmen of the various colleges under the supervision either of the history department or some responsible faculty member.

Few of the students were studying American history in college. The test was designed to determine the amount of United States history that the high school graduate retains from his secondary course.

Last June a survey conducted by the New York Times revealed that 82 percent of the colleges of this country do not require the teaching of United States history for the undergraduate degree. At that time many educators and college presidents declared that inasmuch as the students had taken courses in American history in high school, no need existed to give it again on the college level.

One of the conclusions from the present study is that the students are in need of United States history on the college or university level, even though they have taken courses in this field in high school.

More impressive than the lack of knowledge is the amount of misinformation that the survey disclosed.

A large majority of the college freshmen showed that they had virtually no knowledge of elementary aspects of American history. They could not identify such names as Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, or Theodore Roosevelt, and they had little conception of the significant trends that have made the United States the nation it is today.

The questionnaire was prepared under the supervision of Hugh Russell Fraser, chairman of the Committee on American History, and Dr. Allan Nevins, professor of American history at Columbia University. An attempt was made to include questions dealing with important phases of our history in economic, political, cultural or social fields.

An analysis of the results indicates that either the college freshmen, recently out of high school, were poorly prepared on the secondary level, or they had forgotten whatever they had learned about United States history. On many aspects of American growth and development they indicated a serious lack of knowledge or understanding.

Although it is likely that some of the students were not serious in answering the questions, it is evident, even after discounting that possibility, that the students simply do not know American history.

For example, 1,705 of the 7,000 students or 25 percent, did not know that Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States during the Civil War. Twenty-five students listed George Washington as having been President during that highly important period in American life. Other men listed as having been President during the Civil War included Woodrow Wilson, Ulysses S. Grant, Theodore Roosevelt, William Taft, Herbert Hoover, Andrew Jackson, or Warren G. Harding.

DAVIS CIVIL WAR PRESIDENT

Many students attending southern colleges thought that Jefferson Davis had been President of the United States during the Civil War. Well over 150 college freshmen listed Davis as having been President of this country during that period.

Fifty or more students believed that George Washington was President of the United States during the War of 1812. Others listed for this war include Alexander Hamilton, John Adams, Theodore Roosevelt, Andrew Jackson, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and John Jay. A dozen or more students said there was no President at that time but that the United States was under the direction of George Washington, acting as commander in chief of the Army.

As for the Mexican war of 1846 Presidents listed included John Adams, Theodore Roosevelt, Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Thomas Jefferson, and James G. Blaine. More than 40 names are listed by the students of men who were supposed to have been

President of this country at one period or another in American history but who never held that office.

Evidently the McKinley administration during the Spanish-American War has left little impression upon our students. A little over 1,000 of the 7,000 who answered knew that McKinley had been President. The most common reply was Theodore Roosevelt. Evidently the students did not recognize the fact that Roosevelt came into office after the Spanish-American War.

Moreover, 2,077 students, or 30 percent, did not know what Woodrow Wilson was President of the United States during the last World War.

The men frequently listed as having been President during the last World War were Grover Cleveland, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Warren G. Harding, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt, William McKinley, John Nance Garner, Alf Landon, and Abraham Lincoln. Nearly 100 students thought that Hoover had been President, while 125 listed Coolidge.

The test called upon the students to identify at least two of the contributions to the political, economic, or social developments of the United States by such famous Americans as Lincoln, Jefferson, Jackson, and Theodore Roosevelt. Only 22 percent of American students had mastered enough history in their high school days to identify two contributions made by Lincoln to this country.

Even though this is the bicentennial year for Jefferson, only 1,126 of the 7,000 students, or 16 percent, were familiar with the contributions made by this famous American. Andrew Jackson fared worse, as only 12 percent recognized what he had done, while 19 percent knew something about Roosevelt.

"EMACIATED" THE SLAVES

More than 100 students said that Lincoln had caused the Civil War. To others, Lincoln was famous because he had "emaciated the slaves," was a great pacifier, prevented union, created a fasting day, and permitted the Negroes to vote. Again, various students said that he was the first President of the United States. One college freshman wrote that Lincoln achieved his fame by heading a reconstruction commission to improve the South after the Civil War ended.

Jefferson, likewise, has attained stature in the eyes of the students by many unhistoric accomplishments. He was, for example, president of the Confederacy, founder of the Saturday Evening Post, a Salvation Army worker, and the originator of the Monroe Doctrine. One student wrote that he was a farmer who bought the West with cash. Thirty or more thought that Jefferson earned his right to immortal fame by discovering electricity.

Evidently, Andrew Jackson, despite his place in history, is one of our obscure Presidents. Nearly 50 percent of the students listed him as the famous "Stonewall" Jackson of the Civil War. Others thought he was a "common man," that he instituted the "big stick" policy, and was the father of the United States Constitution.

He is also listed as being a trust buster, of having initiated the Monroe Doctrine, of freeing the slaves, of solidifying the Union, of being a hero in the Spanish-American War of 1898, of taking Texas by force, and of being the first President to be impeached.

Although Theodore Roosevelt's name is important in American history, 81 percent of the college freshmen could not cite two contributions that he had made; however, they did credit him with many obscure and fallacious contributions. Several hundred students said that he was the founder of the National Recovery Act, the Work Projects Administration, and various other New Deal agencies.

COLLECTION OF ANIMAL HEADS

One student wrote that Roosevelt was famous in American life because "he showed that an invalid is not lost." Another said that he "walked on a big stick with a soft voice." Again he was a forest ranger, head of a troop of Negroes which helped free Texas, established price ceilings, was a hero in the War of 1812, fought Pancho Villa, helped quiet the Indians, was a general in the last World War, was President during the World War, purchased Alaska, saved the country from depression, and was the first new dealer.

A student from a western university declared that Roosevelt's greatest contribution to the United States was that "he collected large quantities of animal heads."

Although the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States are significant milestones in this Nation's life, the students indicated that they were only slightly acquainted with both of these great documents. Less than half of the American students could name two of the many specific powers granted to Congress by the Constitution, while only 45 percent could name four specific freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights.

Among the powers granted to Congress, according to the students, are these: power to issue letters of "morque and appraisal," woman suffrage, amending the Constitution, power to make and take away laws, equality of citizenship, keep the Supreme Court checked, right to constrict freedom of President, let bright Negro vote, and power of

"empeachment." One student indicated that one of the specific powers in the Constitution is the "power of voting on the appeasement of the President."

It was found that college students have extreme difficulty in expressing themselves clearly or intelligently. Some of the specific powers, listed in the answers, include: "To make laws providing they are upholding the Constitution"; "its Members shall be elected, not chosen"; "power to impeach the President if majority vote"; "could either approve or not the people the President appointed, if not they couldn't be judges or diplomats"; "amendment power with certain majority for and against"; "has the power to hold office and vote."

A graduate of an eastern high school, with a course in American history and social studies, listed as two of the important powers granted to Congress:

"Congress has the right to pass bills which the President does not wish. Congress has the right to veto bills that the President wishes to be passed."

NEW "FREEDOMS" GUARANTEED

Many new "freedoms" found their way into the historic Bill of Rights. For example, about 500 students listed "freedom from fear" and "freedom from want" as basic parts of the document. Several hundred listed "freedom of thought" or "freedom to think as one wishes." Nearly 1,000 students thought they were guaranteed the right to vote, the right to go to school or the right to work. Freedom to have life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness proved common.

Among the more popular freedoms cited are these: Freedom of choosing own recreation, freedom of labor, freedom from no jobs, freedom for women's votes, freedom of politics, freedom from governmental opinion, freedom to criticize the Government, freedom to buy and sell, freedom from bondage, freedom of way of life, freedom of protection.

Many "rights" were also included. Among them were: Woman suffrage, right to revolution under oppression, right of ownership of property and to do anything you wish with it, right for no prohibition, right to enter any business, right to referendum and recall, right to livelihood, right to get ahead, "right of assylum," right to "bare" arms, right to no slaves, right to impeach the President.

A midwestern student said the Bill of Rights provided the right "not to be punished by whipping," while another replied that it gave "white people in the South the right to lynch Negroes"; another said that "citizens had the freedom to organize for overthrow of government if that government did not act as a government of the people and for the people."

Few of the students displayed any notion of the geographic or historic formation of the United States. For example, of the 7,000 students representing the 36 colleges, only 445, or 6 percent, could name the Thirteen Original Colonies. Frequently the students mentioned such States as Washington, Oregon, Minnesota, Texas, California, Idaho, Wyoming, or Illinois as being among the Thirteen Original Colonies.

American history test by 7,000 students in 36 colleges

Question	Correct answer	Number right	Percent right
1. Name the Thirteen Original States.	New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia.	445	6
2. On what principal body of water are the following cities located:			
(a) Cleveland.	(a) Lake Erie.	1,465	21
(b) St. Louis.	(b) Mississippi.	2,056	29
(c) Cincinnati.	(c) Ohio.	1,561	22
(d) Portland, Oreg.	(d) Columbia.	1,052	15
(e) Memphis.	(e) Mississippi.	1,141	16
(f) Milwaukee.	(f) Lake Michigan.	1,311	19
2. Name two of the specific powers granted to the Congress by the Constitution of the United States.	To borrow money; raise armies; regulate commerce; provide a Navy; establish naturalization laws; coin money; establish post offices; regulate land and sea forces; provide a militia; etc.	3,098	44
4. Name four of the fifteen specific freedoms guaranteed to the individual in the Bill of Rights.	Freedom of religion; freedom of speech; freedom of press; freedom of assembly; freedom of petition; right to bear arms; secure in persons, houses; unreasonable seizure; right to speedy and public trials; not deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law; trial by jury; no excessive bail; etc.	2,122	45
5. Identify at least two of the contributions of the following famous Americans to the political, economic or social development of the United States:			
(a) Abraham Lincoln.	(a) Emancipation Proclamation; President of the United States; humane reconstruction plans; approved Homestead Act (1862); many other specific acts.	1,556	22
(b) Thomas Jefferson.	(b) Louisiana Purchase; President of the United States; author Declaration of Independence; founder of University of Virginia, etc.	1,126	16
(c) Andrew Jackson.	(c) Battle of New Orleans; destroyed Bank of United States; paid off national debt; scotched nullification; etc.	842	12
(d) Theodore Roosevelt.	(d) President of United States; opposed trusts; civil service reformer; conservation pioneer; enforced Sherman anti-trust laws; Panama Canal; etc.	1,313	19
6. Put in their proper sequence:			
(a) 1. Election of William Henry Harrison.	(a) 3. Monroe Doctrine		
2. Jackson's war on the Bank of United States.	2. Jackson's war on bank		
3. Proclamation of Monroe Doctrine.	4. Depression of 1837		
4. Depression or panic of 1837.	1. Election of Harrison.	1,189	17
(b) 1. War with Spain.	(b) 2. Homestead Act		
2. Passage of Homestead Act.	4. Civil service reform		
3. Inauguration of Theodore Roosevelt.	1. War with Spain		
4. Civil service reform.	3. Inauguration of Theodore Roosevelt.	713	10
(c) 1. Dred Scott Decision.	(c) 4. Nullification Act		
2. Mexican War.	2. Mexican War		
3. Compromise of 1850.	3. Compromise of 1850		
4. Nullification Act.	1. Dred Scott Decision.	419	6
(d) 1. The Boy Scout movement.	(d) 3. Transcendentalism		
2. First social settlement houses.	4. First women's college		
3. Transcendentalism.	2. Social settlement houses		
4. The first women's colleges.	1. Boy Scout movement.	345	5
7. Name the home State of the following men during their political prominence:			
John C. Calhoun.	South Carolina.	1,421	20
Andrew Jackson.	Tennessee.	1,079	15
John Quincy Adams.	Massachusetts.	1,118	16
Daniel Webster.	Massachusetts.	1,441	21
Thomas Hart Benton.	Missouri.	74	1
James K. Polk.	Tennessee.	214	3
Henry Clay.	Kentucky.	609	10
Mark Hanna.	Ohio.	225	3
William H. Seward.	New York.	1,007	14
Grover Cleveland.	New York.	1,210	17
8. What was the Nullification Act of South Carolina and how was the controversy resulting settled?	South Carolina passed a law nullifying a tariff act passed by Congress; President Jackson threatened to hang its instigator (Calhoun) and invade the State; Clay put through a compromise tariff and South Carolina backed down; repealed the law.	453	6

American history test by 7,000 students in 36 colleges—Continued

Question	Correct answer	Number right	Percent right
9. After each of the following, write what he was principally famous as:			
Charles W. Eliot.....	Educator, college president.....	614	9
John D. Rockefeller.....	Oil tycoon, banker.....	4,935	71
Jay Cooke.....	Financier, banker.....	344	5
William James.....	Psychologist.....	642	9
Francis Parkman.....	Historian, novelist.....	720	10
Carl Schurz.....	Statesman, reformer.....	294	4
James G. Blaine.....	Statesman, Secretary of State.....	864	14
Walt Whitman.....	Author, poet.....	4,083	59
Henry Thoreau.....	Essayist, author.....	1,159	16
John Burroughs.....	Naturalist, author.....	809	12
James J. Hill.....	Financier.....	671	10
Nicholas Biddle.....	Financier.....	452	6
Alexander Hamilton.....	Financier, Secretary of Treasury, statesman.....	3,360	48
Roger Taney.....	Chief Justice of United States Supreme Court.....	551	8
De Witt Clinton.....	Governor of New York State, statesman.....	1,183	17
Eli Whitney.....	Inventor of cotton gin.....	4,738	68
Jay Gould.....	Financier.....	1,202	17
Henry Ward Beecher.....	Preacher.....	197	9
Alexander H. Stephens.....	Statesman, Vice President of Confederacy.....	111	2
Roger Williams.....	Minister, founder of Rhode Island.....	1,450	20
10. Who was President of the United States during:			
1. The War of 1812.....	James Madison.....	518	13
2. Mexican War.....	James K. Polk.....	910	13
3. Civil War.....	Abraham Lincoln.....	5,295	75
4. Spanish-American War.....	William McKinley.....	1,027	15
5. World War No. 1.....	Woodrow Wilson.....	4,923	70
11. What were the two principal nationalities to migrate from Europe to the United States between 1845 and 1860?	1. Germans; 2. Irish.....	669	14
12. Name the Presidents of the United States who were assassinated.....	1. Garfield.....	734	25
	2. Lincoln.....	4,570	69
	3. McKinley.....	2,141	31
13. Identify:			
Henry L. Stimson.....	Secretary of War.....	4,475	64
Jesse Jones.....	Secretary of Commerce.....	3,231	46
Sumner Welles.....	Under Secretary of State.....	3,263	46
Norman Thomas.....	Leader of a minor political party in the United States.....	2,891	40
George C. Marshall.....	Chief of Staff of the United States Army.....	3,532	50
James F. Byrnes.....	Director of Economic Stabilization.....	2,659	38
Sam Rayburn.....	Speaker of the House.....	2,896	40
Carter Glass.....	Senator from Virginia.....	2,125	30
14. What has been the traditional American policy toward China?	Open Door.....	1,950	15
15. When was the Homestead Act passed?	1862.....	287	4
Before the passage of the Homestead Act what was the minimum price per acre of Federal public lands sold at auction?	\$1.25.....	109	2
16. Name three prominent figures identified with railroad history in the United States.	Vanderbilt, Harriman, Baker, Whitney, Huntington, Stanford, Gould, Washburne, Pullman, etc.....	472	7
17. Name any two prominent figures connected with the growths of trusts and monopolies in the United States.	Rockefeller, du Pont, Mellon, Morgan, etc.....	1,425	20
18. With what inventions are the following names connected:			
Robert Fulton.....	Steamboat.....	4,230	60
Elias Howe.....	Sewing machine.....	3,436	49
Eli Whitney.....	Cotton gin.....	5,131	73
S. F. B. Morse.....	Telegraph.....	4,061	58
George Westinghouse.....	Air brakes.....	797	11
Alexander Graham Bell.....	Telephone.....	4,372	60
Charles Goodyear.....	Rubber vulcanizing.....	4,069	58
19. Name two areas added to the United States by purchase, and from what nations did we acquire them?	Alaska—Russia; Virgin Islands—Denmark; Louisiana Purchase—France; Gadsden Purchase—Mexico; etc.....	1,472	20
20. Name the following:			
A prominent figure, not now living, connected with the organization of labor in the United States.	Samuel Gompers.....	581	14
One such figure connected with the movement for women's rights.	Susan B. Anthony.....	128	13
21. Which was the first United States census in which railway mileage could have been reported?	1840.....	128	2
22. Beginning with Massachusetts, name the 11 States in their geographical order from north to south.	Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida.....	168	3

In naming the Thirteen Original States, one student wrote: "Washington, New York, Oregon, California, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Nebraska, North Carolina, Texas, Minnesota, Maryland, and Delaware." Another student in a well-known eastern college listed the Thirteen Original States as being: "North Carolina, South Carolina, Maine, Delaware, Wisconsin, Kentucky, Utah, Nebraska, Vermont, Ohio, Michigan, and East Virginia."

More than a hundred students listed Texas, Florida, and Missouri as being among the Thirteen Original Colonies. In fact, virtually every one of the 48 States in the Union is included by the students in this category. A typical reply runs something like this: "Oregon, Nebraska, Tennessee, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kentucky, Indiana, Louisiana, Vermont, Maine, Florida, Ohio, and Missouri."

IDEAS ON GEOGRAPHY

Most of our students do not have the faintest notion of what this country looks like. St. Louis, located on America's most famous river, the Mississippi, was placed on the Pacific Ocean, Lake Huron, Lake Erie, the Atlantic Ocean, Ohio River, St. Lawrence River, and almost every place else. Only 15

percent of the college freshmen had any idea where Portland, Ore., was located. Two hundred and fifty students thought that Portland, Ore., was on the Atlantic Ocean, while scores of others placed it on the Ohio River, Tallahassee River, Lake Ontario, Mississippi River, Lake Superior, and Tennessee River.

Twenty-five students replied that Portland was on the Hudson, while several others listed it as being on Long Island Sound. Memphis suffered similar transformations. It was placed on the Colorado River, Cumberland River, Red River, Arkansas River, and Hudson River. Milwaukee was found on Chesapeake Bay, Lake Illinois, Missouri River, Connecticut River, Lake Wisconsin, Salt Lake, Delaware River, and the Pacific Ocean.

Inasmuch as America's history unfolds in a geographic setting, without some concept of this setting an understanding of local and sectional trends would appear impossible. The students were asked to name the States starting with Massachusetts in their geographic order from north to south. Only 3 percent of the students—198 out of 7,000—could list the States along the eastern seaboard with any degree of accuracy.

Many bizarre combinations were received. Hundreds of students wrote that Oregon, Texas, Utah, Tennessee, Illinois, and Nebraska were along the eastern coast. One student who had taken American history in high school listed the States beginning with Massachusetts, and going from north to south, as follows: "Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Oregon, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Texas."

Here is another typical reply: "Delaware, Rhode Island, California, West Virginia, Kentucky, Oregon, Maine, Long Island, Arizona, Massachusetts, and Florida." Still another wrote: "Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, New Hampshire, Florida, Texas, and Utah."

In one question the students were asked to name the Presidents who were assassinated. This was considered an Index question. It was felt that the ability to identify three such landmarks in American history as the assassination of Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley might indicate an ability to identify other important landmarks.

Rather startling results were obtained. For some reason hundreds of students

thought that Harrison, Harding, and Cleveland were the three that were assassinated. A sizable number thought that "every fourth President" was assassinated. Virtually every President of the United States from George Washington to Franklin D. Roosevelt were listed as having lost their lives in this manner.

Once again, it is the misinformation that deserves attention. Among the assassinated Presidents were McClellan, Calhoun, William Jennings Bryan, Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, Alexander Hamilton, Garner, Aaron Burr, Douglas, William Lloyd Garrison, James G. Blaine, and Jefferson Davis. One student from a southern college evidently was still fighting the Civil War, for in response to the query as to the names of the Presidents who had been assassinated, he replied: "Lincoln, and it was a good thing, too."

FAMOUS MEN MISCALLED

An equally poor showing was made by the students when asked to identify famous Americans, both living and dead. Only 30 percent could identify Carter Glass; 38 percent knew who James F. Byrnes is; 46 percent could identify Jesse Jones; 40 percent had heard of Norman Thomas; 40 percent knew Sam Rayburn; 46 percent could identify Sumner Welles; 29 percent had never heard, evidently, of John D. Rockefeller. Nearly 1,000 freshmen, or 14 percent, listed Rockefeller as being either a steel magnate or an oil magnate.

Even the most superficial knowledge of American history implies an understanding of outstanding individuals. Those selected in this survey contributed in some measure to the growth and historic development of the United States. Yet, again, it is the amount of misinformation recorded that is little less than startling.

For example, 35 percent of the students listed Alexander Hamilton as being principally famous as President of the United States. Hamilton was cited also as being Secretary of State, British officer, preacher, founder of Poor Richard's Almanac, traitor, admiral, and inventor of the telephone. A goodly number of students listed Hamilton as being historically important because of his watches.

Typical misinformation concerning other figures who in the varying degree influenced the cultural, political, or social life of this country include:

Charles W. Eliot: Actor, professor of Yale, lawyer, politician, inventor, author of Silas Marner, news correspondent, judge, financier, head of Boy Scouts, and a misguided social worker.

Jay Cooke: Sports, soldier, Secretary of State, racketeer, seaman, traveling bureau, labor agitator, Revolutionary War patriot, signer of Declaration of Independence, pamphleteer. Nearly 1,000 students called Cooke a North Pole explorer, while 500 or more identified him with the Jay treaty with England.

William James: Bandit, brother of Jesse, cowboy, news commentator, founder of Jamestown, robber, author of western stories, gangster, hold-up man, outlaw, lone cowboy. About half of the American college students identified America's pioneer psychologist as having been a bandit or the brother of Jesse.

Carl Schurz: Nazi, World War spy, bund leader, maker of musical instruments, writer of modern poetry, judge, musician, playwright, Bolshevik, black shirt leader, and traitor. Possibly because of his name, one-third of the students identified Schurz as being a Communist or a Nazi.

WALT WHITMAN A MISSIONARY

Walt Whitman: Missionary in Far East, pioneer, colonizer, explorer, speculator, unpatriotic writer, humorist, musician, composer, famous cartoonist, father of blank

verse, English poet, and columnist. Hundreds of students listed Whitman as being an orchestra leader.

John Burroughs: Cartoonist, manufacturer of typewriters, commentator, writer of Tarzan stories, plow inventor, politician. Although 12 percent could identify Burroughs as an essayist and author, 40 percent identified him as a maker of typewriters or adding machines.

Nicholas Biddle: President, Speaker of the House, Attorney General, newspaperman, Ambassador, reformer, Cabinet Officer under Washington, theologian, Senator, postmaster, Marine officer, recent naval officer, Prussian prince. Evidently confusing him with Francis Biddle, many students listed Nicholas Biddle as the Attorney General of today.

Roger Taney: Gangster, Taney murder ring, Boy Scout leader, racketeer, reformer, French envoy, pioneer, writer, cartoonist, Governor of New York, Vice President, swindler, secretary under Washington.

Jay Gould: Leader of rebellion, newspaperman, department store, political pamphleteer, composer, peacemaker, member of Washington Cabinet, author, inventor of Gould pump, song writer, cartoonist, man of mustard fame, signer of Declaration of Independence, Broadway entertainer.

Henry Ward Beecher: Senator, poet, Presidential candidate in 1893, scientist, journalist, humorist, financier, sewing machine, agitator, priest, civil-service reform. Two thousand of our high-school graduates declared that Henry Ward Beecher wrote Uncle Tom's Cabin.

ROGER WILLIAMS, MOVIE STAR

Roger Williams: Movie star, Revolutionary hero, Williams and Clark expedition, Virginia settler, inventor of silverware, helped settle Maryland, traitor, manufacturer of silver spoons, Governor of Massachusetts, military leader, founded Delaware, printer, founded Pennsylvania, founder of Williams College, Quaker, Methodist Church founder, Protestant church founder, witty news commentator, settled New Hampshire, expedition to Oregon, in Washington's Cabinet, founder of Baptist Church.

Few students could name the home State of a list of 10 prominent men who helped make American history. It was felt that students of United States history should have some idea of the section of the country that such men as Calhoun, Clay, Jackson, Adams, or Webster came from. Yet the responses by the students indicate that they had not the faintest notion of the home States of our former political leaders.

However, it is the astounding misinformation that deserves attention. Calhoun is listed as being a native of Arizona, Kansas, Maine, New York, Vermont, Illinois, and various Northern or Western States. Daniel Webster and John Quincy Adams, famous in Massachusetts history, are listed from Kentucky, Missouri, Florida, Virginia, South Carolina, or Georgia.

Six percent of the students knew what the Nullification Act of South Carolina was, and how the resulting controversy was settled. Most of the replies indicated that the students were ignorant of this period of American history. The first great challenge to the supremacy of the Union was made by the South Carolina Legislature in 1832. This incident, including the role played by Calhoun and Clay, is a vital segment in the over-all picture of American history.

Typical answers provided by 94 percent of the students are:

"South Carolina refused to pay the whisky tax"; "South Carolina refused to nullify act of union and formed southern confederacy"; "South Carolina declared the slaves law of the Constitution null and void"; "the refusal of South Carolina to have prohibition"; "South Carolina wanted to nullify its claim as being a member of the Union"; "when

slaves were born in South Carolina"; "nullify the signing of the Declaration of Independence"; "Negroes were not allowed to vote, settled by arbitration, North seceded"; "South Carolina refused to ratify the Constitution."

Immigration has played an important part in the development of this country. The students disclosed a woeful ignorance on this subject. Fourteen percent of the students knew that the Germans and Irish were the principal nationalities to migrate from Europe to the United States between 1845 and 1860. Nearly 500 listed the Chinese and Japanese as being the two principal races to migrate here from Europe during these years. Other hundreds listed such nationalities as Greeks, Armenians, Russians, Spanish, Slavs, Polish, Swedes, Mongolians, Norwegians, Italians, Dutch, Balkans, French, Ethiopians, Turks, Huguenots, and Czechs.

On questions of straight factual knowledge the college freshmen were extremely misinformed. Only 4 percent knew that the Homestead Act was passed in 1862, and 2 percent knew that before the passage of this act the minimum price for an acre of Federal public lands sold at auction was \$1.25. Hundreds of students thought that the Homestead Act was passed in 1920, 1930, or even 1940, while on the other extreme the years 1610, 1630, or 1690 were mentioned. One student thought it was passed "a long time ago."

The value of land in this country ranged all the way from nothing to \$1,000 an acre. Other answers were 2 cents a square foot, 6 cents an acre, \$475 an acre, \$900 an acre. One student who had studied American history in high school wrote that the Homestead Act was passed in 1660, and before the passage of that act land sold at \$900 an acre.

HAZY ABOUT RAILROADS

Although railroads have played an important role in American life, the college freshmen were almost ignorant of developments in this area. Only 7 percent could name three prominent figures identified with railroad history in the United States, and 2 percent knew when the first United States census in which railway mileage could have been reported was taken.

Prominent railway figures included such men as Andrew Jackson, DeWitt Clinton, Samuel Fulton, Jesse Jones, Herbert Hoover, Calvin Coolidge, and Thomas Jefferson. Fifteen hundred students listed Casey Jones as a famous railway man, while a large number cited Wells Fargo, Buffalo Bill, or Jim Brady. Many students said that the first railroad was founded in this country in 1941, 1940, 1910, or 1905. On the other extreme many thought that the railroads first came here in 1590, 1610, or 1650.

An almost endless list of names, except the right ones, were given by the students when asked to identify two prominent figures connected with the growth of trusts and monopolies in the United States. Among those listed were William Green, Jefferson, Stimson, Monroe, Coolidge, Morgenthau, Gompers, Rayburn, Hamilton, and Lincoln Steffens.

One of the questions called upon the students to name a prominent figure not now living connected with the organization of labor in the United States, and a comparable figure connected with women's rights. Here again the students indicated that they had no conception of the important leaders in either the labor or the suffrage fields.

Although the question asked for the naming of a labor leader not now living, 1,000 students listed John L. Lewis, while about half that number listed William Green. Others commonly named were Mark Hanna, Daniel Webster, Harriet Stowe, Samuel Insull, Huey Long, Henry Clay, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Karl Marx, Harry Bridges, and Abraham Lincoln.

An even more diffuse list was cited in connection with women's rights. Most com-

monly listed were Frances Perkins, Eleanor Roosevelt, and Claire Booth Luce.

SAMUEL GOMPERS MISNAMED

Many of the students have a hazy or sloppy idea of correct spelling. For example, Samuel Gompers, the labor leader, was listed as S. Goeppers, Samuel Goebels, Sam Grumpers, Sol Gomphers, and Samuel Goobles. Frequently the student would cite William Lewis or John L. Green as important labor leaders not now living.

On another factual question, that of naming two areas added to the United States by purchase, the students once again revealed their ignorance of United States history. Although they had a number of possible replies to choose from, 80 percent of the students either did not know or gave entirely false replies to this question.

Some of the purchases made by this country, according to the students, include: Alaska from the Dutch, Japanese, Mexicans, Great Britain, Denmark, Spain, or China; Louisiana from Sweden; Philippines from Great Britain, Holland, France, and Russia; Kentucky from France; Virgin Islands from Spain; Nova Scotia from Holland; Hawaii from Norway; Iceland from Germany.

Students were asked to indicate the traditional American policy toward China. Only 15 percent knew that we have maintained the open-door policy. For the most part the students thought that our policy had been to prevent immigration, to send them missionaries, and to exploit her.

Some of the typical responses are: "Try to wake Ch'na up and become a successful nation," "Get as much as possible for as little as possible," "America has always used China as a source of revenue for its rich businessmen who established themselves there," "Sympathize but do little else," "One of not much interest, but had one eye on her," "A fatherly attitude, although sometimes not concerned," "Exploitation until she became underdog to Japan," "Wanting China to win and sending damn little to help her," "The closed-door policy."

COMMENT ON CHINA

Other typical comments are: "To help China out if it doesn't require too much effort on our part"; "Express friendship but ignore them when they need help"; "We have sent supplies to her but not in quantities"; "We have looked down on her"; "Exclusion of all Chinese immigrants into the United States except students and only there a quota"; "A useful tolerance and exploitation"; "Bringing the light of modern ways to this darkened land"; "To be on friendly but not intimate terms."

One student in some indignation declared that our policy was to "buy their rice, drink their tea, starve their poor." Another student said that "we like China but never fooled around with her relations until she became an ally."

Analyzing the results of this Nation-wide test, the conclusion is inescapable that high-school students now possess an insufficient knowledge of United States history. One way to remedy this defect would appear to be that of requiring all college students to take courses in this important field.

Institutions that participated in the survey included Boston University, Brooklyn College, Bucknell, City College, University of Cincinnati, Colgate, College of Good Council, Dartmouth, George Washington University, Hunter, Illinois Institute of Technology, Indiana University, Kansas University, Kentucky University, Marquette, Maryland University, Massachusetts State College, Mount Holyoke, New York University, North Carolina University, Pennsylvania State College, Pennsylvania University, Pittsburgh University, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Rhode Island State College, Smith College, Texas University, Tulane, Virginia University, Washington University, State College of

Washington, Central Washington College of Education, Eastern Washington College of Education, Western Reserve, William and Mary, and Yeshiva College.

[From the New York Times of April 5, 1943]
SENATORS DEPLORE STUDENT IGNORANCE OF NATION'S HISTORY—GUFFEY CONSIDERS CALLING FOR INQUIRY ON MEANS TO PROMOTE BETTER TEACHING—"OUTRAGEOUS," SAYS BUTLER—OTHER EDUCATORS ARE EQUALLY VEHEMENT OVER CONDITIONS REVEALED BY SURVEY

Results of the Nation-wide survey revealing deplorable ignorance on the part of college freshmen of basic fundamentals of United States history provoked widespread comment yesterday, not only in educational quarters, but in official circles at Washington.

At the National Capital, it seemed certain that the survey, conducted by the New York Times, would be a subject of discussion in the Senate tomorrow. Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, Pennsylvania Democrat, announced he was considering introduction of a resolution calling for an inquiry into means by which the Federal Government can promote better instruction of history in the schools.

Other Senators expressed amazement at the results and indicated they would have something to say on the subject if the matter is debated in the upper House.

"OUTRAGEOUS," SAYS BUTLER

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, declared it was "perfectly outrageous that such a situation should exist."

"I not only read and reread the survey," he said, "but I cut it out of the paper and intend to discuss it from time to time to show what it means to this country. It is the most revealing and far-reaching exhibition of what we thought was going on in education."

Other educators were equally vehement in deploring the situation. Some thought the questionnaire, which was answered by 7,000 students in 36 colleges in every section of the Nation, had been drawn along too narrow lines, but all agreed that, even if it had been expanded, the results probably would have been the same.

Other outstanding educators refused to comment immediately, but indicated they intended giving the matter thorough study. Among this group were Dr. John W. Studebaker, Commissioner of the Office of Education; Dr. Frank W. Hubbard, of the National Education Association; Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve, of Barnard College; and Ellsworth Buck, president of the New York City Board of Education.

EXTREMISTS ARE BLAMED

Hugh Russel Fraser, official of the Office of Education and chairman of its committee on American history, issued a statement at Washington placing responsibility on social studies extremists for the present appalling neglect of American history in the high schools and elementary schools of the Nation.

He asserted that while there was no charge that they were trying to teach any particularism, they just were not teaching American history at all.

Dr. Ralph H. Gabriel, Larned professor of American history at Yale, said:

"American history is a normal senior-year study in high schools and other preparatory schools and, therefore, students have American history the year before they enter college. The Time's survey of the knowledge of American history which college freshmen have suggests that the teaching in the high and other preparatory schools is inadequate. In view of this disclosure the matter might well be further investigated."

Dr. Harry N. Wright, president of City College, declared one could not draw hard and

fast conclusions from the survey, though the results were obviously bad.

"All must agree the results are bad," he said, "but why are they bad? And is this lack of knowledge confined solely to history or does it crop up in all other required subjects in the secondary schools?"

Dr. Albert Bonaschi, vice president of the city board of education, declared it was "discouraging and disheartening to see that so few young persons who soon will be in the Army, are going to fight for their country without knowing the very basic facts about our American democracy." He asserted the situation must be remedied for the test itself was, if anything, "too elementary."

A similar reaction was registered by Prof. Wilbur Hallenbeck of Teachers College, Columbia, who held the survey provided "a clue to the need of getting a better understanding in the minds of the rising generation of the background of democracy." He felt, too, that the test had been too limited in scope, but agreed results might not have been a whit different had it been expanded.

One of the members of the board of higher education in New York City felt the questionnaire dealt too much in names and dates and too little in the great eras and fundamental movements in American history. He nevertheless agreed the results were appalling.

Prof. Eugene B. Riley of the history department of Fordham University, said he thought the survey's results were typical of those which might be expected from college freshmen. He pointed out that in many high schools, social science courses are substituted for history courses and, in addition, by the time the student has reached his freshman year it is a long time since he has had a history course.

Professor Riley said he agreed with the conclusion that courses in American history should be required in the undergraduate course. He said he thought the test, on the whole, was fair if adequate time was allowed and the scoring fair to the student; several questions, however, were not satisfactory, he believed. He did not think students should be required to retain the connection of Westinghouse with the air brake, and he pointed out that the question designed to suggest the name of Samuel Gompers was ambiguously worded, as well as of questionable importance.

[From the New York Times of April 5, 1943]
SCHOOL TEST STIRS ACTION IN SENATE—GUFFEY CONSIDERING RESOLUTION FOR INQUIRY SEEKING WAYS FOR UNITED STATES TO SPUR HISTORY STUDY—DEBATE TUESDAY LIKELY—HEAD OF COMMITTEE ON UNITED STATES HISTORY PLACES THE BLAME ON SOCIAL STUDIES EXTREMISTS

WASHINGTON, April 4.—The remarkable vagueness of American college freshmen on American history disclosed in a New York Times survey published this morning will probably be the subject of Senate discussion this week.

With the Committee on Education and Labor starting hearings Tuesday on Federal aid to education, Senator GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania, said tonight that he would take up with Chairman THOMAS the introduction of a resolution calling for Federal aid in teaching history in the schools of the country.

Several other Senators, some of them members of the committee, had strong views on the subject and felt that opportunity should be given to present them on the floor of the Senate.

The striking results of the survey seem likely to bring on a debate which will have repercussions in military as well as educational circles.

The War Department has already indicated to the Federal Office of Education that it

would like a higher status for American history in the Victory course for high-school students. The subject is required in the courses supervised by the Army in colleges.

Comment on the results of the survey was declined by those officials of the National Education Association who could be reached in Washington. Dr. Frank W. Hubbard said that he would want to know how the study was made. Reticence was also shown by Dr. John W. Studebaker, Commissioner of the Office of Education.

SOCIAL STUDIES TECHNIQUE

But Hugh Russell Fraser, who, besides being an official of the Office of Education, is chairman of the Committee on American History, held "social-studies extremists" responsible for the present appalling neglect of American history in the high schools and elementary schools of the Nation.

Exonerating them of any desire to teach communism or socialism, he said the trouble was not that they were trying to teach any particular "ism" in connection with American history but that they were not teaching American history at all.

The resolution which Senator GUFFEY is considering would call for the appointment of an education subcommittee of six members to study ways and means for the Federal Government to promote better instruction in American history in the schools.

SENATORS DIFFER ON TEACHING

Chairman THOMAS said it was no news that Americans had not learned their own history very well.

"I do not think, however, that this is the result of faulty teaching," he went on.

"Perhaps what it demonstrates is the need for more Federal aid to education so that we may have more equality of educational opportunity.

"Let us not forget that 800,000 boys who were physically fit had to be rejected by the Army because they could not read or write.

"What chance did they have to learn our history although there was never a battle in that history which the presence of 800,000 more soldiers on the battlefield would not have changed?"

Senator BONE, a member of the committee, thought poor teaching methods must bear part of the blame for the situation disclosed by the Times survey.

"This is one of the most remarkable documents I have ever seen," he said. "It is an indictment of our system of teaching. We are fighting a terrible war to preserve a system which rests on magnificent traditions, and it will be a shock to most people to know how little knowledge of our national history our high-school students have absorbed.

"Our emotions are deeply stirred by appeals to our patriotism and love of country, but, in the light of these startling revelations, one can only ask himself just how deeply we cherish the beautiful things we know so little about.

"It is time to take stock of some of our educational processes. If we love America as we think we do, the time is here to let our boys and girls know what we are fighting for."

DUTY SEEN FOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Senator TAFT, also a member of the committee, said that he had never been able to see why our high schools did not teach more American history than they do.

"There is a fair amount of criticism of our whole educational program today," he commented.

Senator AIKEN, another committee member, said:

"Of course, I think people should know more about our own history than they do. This does not only apply to our boys and girls. It would not hurt some of our adults if they had a little more knowledge of the subject.

"I would approve an investigation of our educational system to see why we cannot attain this result. Americans must know American history not only because it is their own but because it is the most important part of the history of democracy and self-government and cannot be duplicated by any other country."

Senator O'MAHONEY, who put the results of the Times first educational survey last June in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, said:

"Taken in conjunction with your survey a year ago your second one certainly demonstrates the need for more attention to American history. It indicates a lack of knowledge of the fundamental concepts of Americanism. That is the danger.

IGNORING OF FUNDAMENTALS

"It is evident we are training the present generation on lines that utterly ignore the basis on which the Bill of Rights was written.

"When you consider the lack of knowledge of United States history revealed by your two studies you begin to see why so many of our States and counties have got into the habit of looking to Washington for help instead of enjoying the thrill of free government and free enterprise.

"If the survey is a correct indication, our public-school system is failing to educate the rising generation in the fundamentals which led to the Declaration of Independence. It is especially strange that this revelation should be made in the week of Jefferson's Birthday, and only a few days before we are going to unveil a memorial to him here in Washington."

Senator LANGER said he thought that the results of the survey demonstrated the need for an immediate and thorough investigation of the Office of Education.

"It seems that an attempt was made, though perhaps unconsciously, to undermine the morale of our boys and girls," he said. "To my mind it is not an adequate explanation just to say that the teaching of history has been lost sight of in courses of social study."

Maj. Harold Kent, who acts as liaison officer between the War Department and the Office of Education, commented that the Army had made a 12-week intensive course in American history one of the required subjects which college students must take under Army supervision. As for the high schools, he said:

"The Army believes in the need for a strong course in the American background, for you cannot understand what the war means unless you understand the institutions which make up this country—and that means unless you know American history."

FRASER'S ANALYSIS OF SITUATION

Mr. Fraser's statement follows:

"Responsibility for the present appalling neglect of American history in the high schools and elementary schools of the Nation must go to the social studies extremists," he said in a statement. "They have acted toward United States history instruction like the proverbial bull in the china shop.

"The pitfall they have stumbled into has been due to a failure to recognize that the structure of history does not lend itself to the technique of the social studies. And this failure has led to tragic results.

"Now, almost too late, some of them are beginning to realize that history, which is essentially the recording of events, requires, in its elementary stages, a chronological, time-sequence approach which is not necessarily characteristic of the social studies as a whole.

"And this chronological, time-sequence approach to American history, which the social studies extremists have abandoned, has led to some curious results.

"The tragedy really began in 1924 in Denver, Colo., when the superintendent of schools, acting on suggestions from Teachers College, Columbia University, moved to substitute a course in social science for the then-existing courses in American history and geography.

"Previously, a course outline in the social sciences or studies had been published by the State of South Dakota in 1915, but the documents issued at Pierre had only recommended the course as a supplementary one to American history. The Denver course was designed to replace American history.

WRONG TECHNIQUE CHARGED

"That day in 1924 in Denver should go down in the history of American education as a day of mourning. For on that day the professors of education, using Denver as a starting point, invaded the field of a subject with a technique that was wholly unadapted for it.

"It was a strange and incredible hour. Here was the dramatic story of Jefferson and Jackson, of Washington and Franklin, the drama of an America unfolding in logical and chronological form—the story, in fact, of 'the greatest experiment in democratic government in the history of the world'—and yet we see the professors of education walking in and saying in substance:

"Here, none of this nonsense. We are not concerned with the details of your history. We are concerned with social trends and ideas. We want the students to analyze and describe social phenomena. That is what we mean by 'social studies,' and we cannot be bothered with your history unless it has some bearing on events now—today."

"It was, of course, sheer and appalling insolence. Yet the idea spread like a prairie fire, and soon American history, for all practical intents and purposes, was on the way out.

"Illustrative of the extremes to which this apathy and indifference to the history of the United States has gone is the reply of a well-known social studies advocate who when asked if he did not think the school children of America should have some knowledge of Thomas Jefferson, replied:

"Well, if there is anything about Jefferson that may be said to have a particular bearing on events today, I would say 'Yes.' Otherwise not."

"It is this kind of approach to the history of the United States which the committee and millions of Americans would like to know how to combat.

SOME PITFALLS ARE LISTED

"First, however, there are several pitfalls to avoid. The friends of American history must note them well or the professors of education will still be smirking in their lofty perches in the great universities. And nothing will be done.

"These pitfalls are:

"1. Care must be taken not to assail the social studies extremists as Communists or Socialists. They are not. True, there may be here and there exceptions, but as a group they are not at all in this category. Naturally, they would like nothing better than this line of attack be taken up, for it is the easiest to disprove. The case against them is not that they are teaching any 'ism' connected with American history, but that they are not teaching American history at all.

"2. A campaign to make American history compulsory in the schools should be avoided. Twenty-six States require such study now, but the laws in every one of these States is worthless. There is nothing in any of these laws to stop educators, under the dominance of social studies extremists, from calling a miscellaneous discussion of sociology, civics, geography, psychology, and current events by the name of 'American history,' and getting

away with it. And this is being done today throughout the Nation in thousands of schools.

"The question then arises: What can be done?"

"The committee suggests several preliminary procedures:

"1. National, State, and local educational and civic groups should demand that the schools throw off the shackles of the social studies extremists with regard to instruction in American history in its elementary stages. The subject should be taught in a chronological, time-sequence manner.

"All topical and arbitrary outlines of study should be discarded as superficial and arbitrary. Any of the standard history texts constitute a better outline than any set of typewritten pages.

"2. In most high schools the course in American history is put off to the next to the last year. Hundreds of thousands of students never reach this year. A thorough chronological, time-sequence course should be instituted in the first year of high school and all students required to take it.

"3. The committee feels that once the student has a real background knowledge of the structure of American history, his interest in further study can be increased if he is required to make an original study of some phase or event of our history of his own choosing.

"Such a thesis should be required after the half-way mark in the course had been reached. A subject of his or her own selection, if made the subject of an original investigation, will enkindle an interest in the whole subject pattern.

"These are the committee's three preliminary suggestions and will involve, even in this preliminary stage, a radical revision in the approach to the subject as it is now being taught in thousands of our schools."

Mr. WILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President—

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota said he wanted to speak on the same subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. WILEY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator's permission to yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], who wishes to speak on the same subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I thought I was accommodating the distinguished Senator. I desire to speak for only 5 minutes, so I think I shall carry on in my own right.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the insertion in the RECORD of a matter having to do with the question discussed by the senior Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WILEY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the most interesting comment on this extraordinary educational survey is the one made by Mr. Hugh Russell Fraser, who was one of those who prepared the questions as an official of the Office of Education and as chairman of its committee on American history. I ask unanimous consent that his analysis of the situation, which apparently has been prepared with some care, and was a part of the investi-

gation before the questionnaires referred to today came in, be printed in fine type in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Reprinted from Education for March 1943]

NEGLECT OF AMERICAN HISTORY

(By Hugh Russell Fraser)

The story of the neglect of American history, particularly in our secondary schools, is an astonishing one.

The New York Times, on June 21, 1942, brought the attention of the Nation to the general situation in the colleges. True, no mention was made at the time of the high schools and elementary schools. On May 3, however, Dr. Allan Nevins, professor of American history at Columbia University and twice Pulitzer prize winner, had charged that the treatment of the subject in the secondary schools was of a casual and incidental nature, meriting the most careful and exhaustive investigation.

The Times survey on the college level revealed that the study of American history is not required for graduation in 82 percent of our colleges; that 72 percent do not require it for entrance; that less than 10 percent of the undergraduate body in the spring semester, 1942, were enrolled in United States history classes; that only 8 percent of the freshmen classes were studying it, although 30 percent were enrolled in European history courses; that in 48 percent of the teachers colleges, where the teachers of tomorrow are trained, a study of American history is not required for graduation; that in many of our colleges and universities it is possible for a student to receive the stamp of approval as an expert in the field of government without ever having taken any course in the history of the United States; and that the percentage of the members of the graduating classes who had taken any instruction in college in American history varied from 2 percent to a rare high of 15 percent in some universities.

Hardly had the Times survey been published than emphatic press comment followed. The Detroit Free Press said the important issue now is: "What are the grade schools doing?" The Baltimore Sun observed that in view of the fact that the American citizen is the final authority on the matters of national policy, the assumption that his formal education need not include any study of how these have worked out in the past is hard to understand. The New York World-Telegram declared that a very large number of men and women who complete college courses have no knowledge of the background of their Nation beyond the juvenile, superficial, and limited courses given to children in the grade school.

Said the Indianapolis News: "Something is very definitely wrong when the majority of Hoosier colleges lump United States history courses in the so-called social-studies classification that is usually optional with all those students who are majoring in history. We surrender all too easily when we allow American history to be ladled out in small doses of civics, citizenship, economics, politics, and what-have-you. Can it be honestly affirmed that the student who takes one or two of these courses actually knows the history of his country?"

Soon after the Times survey, the Committee on American History, composed of representatives of various national organizations, was organized in Washington to investigate the status of American history in the secondary schools.

To that end, the social studies trend in certain so-called experimental or laboratory schools was examined.

Probably the No. 1 guinea pig of the social studies group is the Milne School, Albany, N. Y. Milne is the 6-year laboratory school of the New York State College for Teachers. Here instruction is given by senior students of the college. They work under the sharp eye of faculty members especially trained in latest developments in the social studies. A special report on their curriculum was prepared for the national council for the social studies by Wallace Taylor and Donnal V. Smith.

The student at Milne comes into first contact with the history of the Nation in the eighth grade where he learns about "The National Community." This is a social-studies word for the United States. Here his instruction is divided into seven parts. But only one of these seven parts concerns the development of our political democracy.

The other six have such titles as: Geographic Expansion, Extension of Social Democracy, National Unity, Changes in American Culture, Relation With Other Nations, and Citizenship.

Grade nine is devoted to a study of "The World Community and the Economic Problems of the Individual."

In grade ten the student is given an elaborate course in "Man's Advancing Culture." This seems to be a preparation for the last or final year, the twelfth grade—where the single topic is "Social Relationships."

Therefore, it takes only a simple process of deduction to note that the eleventh grade is left for American history. But here a riddle develops. The year is divided into five equal parts. The titles are: 1. Introduction to American Culture. 2. Government in the United States. 3. Growth of our Economic System. 4. Culture and Ways of Living in the United States. 5. World Relationships.

Now subdivision No. 2 appears to be American history. Indeed, part of it is. It is subdivided as follows: 1. Constitutional government. 2. Political parties and conflicting issues. 3. Development of suffrage. 4. Documents, laws, and doctrines that continue the democratic tradition. 5. Philosophers and leaders in democracy. 6. Services rendered by local and national governments.

Incidentally, all this adds up to only one-fifth of one grade. In this incredibly short interim the student is given a small—very small dose of American political history.

So singular is this situation that when the Committee on American History made this specific charge, the principal of the school, Dr. Robert W. Frederick, came back with this admission: "Yes; we do decrease our emphasis on political and politico-military history to provide opportunity for a consideration of economic, social, and industrial history." Yet there is hardly any presentation of American political history at all.

Is this a pattern for the schools of tomorrow?

Take another laboratory school, Wisconsin High School at Madison, Wis.

Examination of the curriculum discloses that the eighth grade opens with such topics as How May I Become Aware of and Sensitive to the Significant Social Problems of My Day? How May I Become Skilled in Techniques of Problem Solving? etc.

The ninth grade is devoted to ancient and medieval history. The tenth grade is given to world history.

In the eleventh grade we find a shade of our old friend again, American history. But the study course is subdivided into eight,

instead of five, parts. And here, curiously enough, only two of these eight parts concern the history of America's political development.

Miss Ruth Johnson, who prepared the course outline, explained that unit 3, as well as units 1 and 4, concerned American history.

Nevertheless, Wisconsin is one of 26 States that requires a year of American history.

Now for our third illustration, let's go to another major demonstration school, the one at Eugene, Oreg.

The topic for grade 7 is Industrial Problems Considered From Regional Viewpoint With a National Outlook. That is self-explanatory.

Grade 8 is entitled "The Growth and Development of American Culture." This looks like the real thing, but our first subdivision turns out to be "Orientation—How can I live effectively in my new school environment?" Subdivision 2 is "Personal, social adjustments: How can I get along with older people?"

Subdivision 4, it seems, is worth our attention. It is titled "Development of the West: What can the West Contribute to the Cultural Development of the United States?" Even this can hardly be termed truly United States history. Obviously, there is a difference between "What did the West contribute?" and "What can the West contribute?" Only the former is history.

The ninth grade is concerned with "Contemporary Problems of the Community." Grade 10 is entitled "The Growth of Mankind Toward the Democratic Way of Life."

Ordinarily there might be a little American history there—but no, a break-down of the title shows only 1 item out of 16 that might fairly be considered as relating even indirectly to the history of the United States.

At last we come to grade 11. Here we find the familiar 11 subdivisions, one of which is entitled "Social Security: How Can We Provide Social Security for All?" Other sections are variously headed "School government," "Municipal government," "State government," "Recreation and leisure," etc.

But only 1 subdivision out of 16 has a bearing on American history. This is titled "Freedom and Civil Rights: How Did We Get Our Freedom and Civil Rights, and How Can We Keep Them?"

This is Eugene's ration of American history. Just one-eleventh of a year's course.

In reply to the committee's charge of neglect, Superintendent J. F. Cramer, of the Eugene public schools, cites the number of hours devoted every day to the "social living" course which he says "includes all English and language activities, history, geography, civics, and orientation and counseling." Then he says:

"The Eugene social-living course has been formally accepted by the State superintendent of public instruction, Rex Putnam, as meeting all the requirements for the course in history and civics."

Oregon law, of course, requires a course in American history. The law, of course, is worthless. No penalty is attached to its nonenforcement and the matter is left wholly within the discretion of the State superintendent of public instruction. There is nothing in the law to prevent the latter official from accepting the latest edict of Teachers College, Columbia University, as to what is or is not American history.

Now it so happens that 26 States have laws requiring instruction in American history in the public schools. Not one of them can be enforced.

Wisely, for these reasons, Governor James, of Pennsylvania, in 1942 vetoed a bill passed in Pennsylvania imposing certain duties on the superintendent of public instruction in regard to United States history. Obviously, this kind of legislation is worse than futile, for unless a specific time-sequence course is

directed and penalties attached, the social studies boys can ignore it. Nor is a proposal recently introduced in the New York Assembly by Assemblyman Glancy to require a year's study of United States history any wiser.

Prof. Samuel McKee, for 16 years a member of the Columbia University department of history, has recently put the whole problem succinctly. Says Professor McKee:

"The emergence of the social studies is in large part responsible for the disappearance of American history from the high-school curriculum. The amount of history in the average social studies course has almost reached the vanishing point. As a result, the students get through school knowing little about American history, and even holding this subject in contempt."

"Teachers' colleges are responsible," Professor McKee believes, "for this unwholesome development. Many persons in these colleges want to make names for themselves by advocating teaching methods that are novel or different, although not necessarily better."

His remedy is equally plain and sound:

"A good American history course of at least 1 year's duration should be required in every high school. Instead of teaching it in the glorified way now so popular in many schools, the course should primarily be concerned with the moving panorama of American history from the beginning to the present."

Now let us examine the curriculum in a typical American city, say, Pittsburgh. Here we find one-half a year's course is given to American history. Dr. Charles E. Manwiller, director of the curriculum department, explains the course is given in the first semester of the eleventh grade. Then he adds: "The work of the second semester is given a historical slant, and, therefore, I contend we offer a full year of American history in our high schools."

In the Pittsburgh Press of October 31, 1942, appeared a letter from a supervisor of a social studies department in a high school outside of Pittsburgh. He wrote:

"It is possible to become an American history high-school teacher in Pennsylvania without ever having taken a single hour of American history in college as part of one's preparation. In my judgment such conditions are disgraceful any time; but today they border on something more serious. In a letter I can hardly tell you how deeply I feel about this whole matter. As a parent and as an educator, I am most concerned about saving our democracy. And I realize that we cannot save it if we aren't acquainted with it."

It would not be fair to contend, of course, that the plight of American history in Pittsburgh is essentially different from that of any other American city. Only a little more investigation has been made there. In 1936, for instance, a simple quiz was put to 400 students who had applied for work-relief under the National Youth Administration program. Only a few questions were asked as to their knowledge of United States history. One was: "Who is Herbert Hoover?" Out of 400, a total of 74 replied blithely he was "head of the G-men."

Incidentally, students who were normal on other subjects were found to be woefully ignorant of the simplest facts of American history. One 13-year-old girl, who made good grades in other subjects, could not name the first President of the United States. Another, 15 years old, could not say who Theodore Roosevelt was and finally guessed he was head of the Daughters of American Revolution.

In certain States—Alabama is a typical example—an orderly, chronological presentation of American history is not expected by the social studies advisors. In fact, a half a year is divided between the history of the United States and the history of Alabama—and even this half a year is based upon cur-

rent events with occasional glances over the shoulder at the past.

The Alabama Department of Education published in 1941 an elaborately printed 270-page book entitled "Program of Studies and Guide to the Curriculum for Secondary Schools." It is a detailed description of the type of courses offered in the junior and senior high schools of the State, both required and elective, yet it contains only one paragraph in which its social-studies authors deign to even discuss what might be called the history of the United States.

In one paragraph the authors make it very clear that the past is to be considered merely as an appendage of the present—sort of a throw-back from events of today. Says the guide (p. 68):

"Beginning with present social and economic conditions and problems in community, State, region, and Nation, this course should develop abilities and interests in using history, biography, and related literature in interpreting present conditions and problems in such a way that pupils derive satisfaction and pleasure from the experiences."

That means, in other words, that Alabama social-studies teachers should give a little American history in the eleventh grade, but on two conditions: (1) That the starting point be always present social and economic conditions, and (2) that nothing be taught that will not give all the pupils pleasure and satisfaction.

Incidentally, there is only one other place in the guide where the authors are unable to avoid at least an indirect reference to the teaching of American history. That is a passing mention (p. 251) under School Laws of an enactment of the Legislature of the State of Alabama requiring instruction in the Constitution of the United States.

Yet there is discussion of problems of plant growth in the community; food problems in the community; study of family "trees" by pupils for their own satisfaction; and even half a page (p. 127) devoted to the problem of homemaking for boys.

The truth is that the neglect of our history in the colleges is mild compared to the neglect in the secondary schools. Indeed, there seems to be the false assumption everywhere that someone else is doing the teaching job. The colleges assume that the high schools are providing a basic understanding of American history; and the high schools assume the job is done in the elementary schools. When, as a matter of fact, it is not being done anywhere, except where the time-sequence form is used.

From Charles A. Beard, dean of American historians, and himself associated for years with the social studies movement, has come a sharp warning that the present trend must be checked.

Writes Dr. Beard: "The decline in emphasis on the teaching of American history has been accompanied by an increase in the amount of instruction in sociology, economics, current questions, problems of democracy, and other subjects pertaining to such interests. As a result the overwhelming majority of our adult citizens have had little or no instruction in American history, at least beyond the barest rudiments during the years of their elementary education."

Among social studies partisans, Dr. Beard's name is one to conjure with; texts written by him are among those used as the background of social studies courses in both junior and senior high schools. Yet Dr. Beard's warning has not appeared, nor has it been quoted, in any social studies publication, nor has it been given any publicity except through the medium of the civic education service.

And this, too, is the measure of the distrust and resentment of all criticism prevalent among the social studies people. They have been so accustomed to criticism of the

educational program of others that they cannot admit even the presence of dissent from a high source.

Yet the one bright hope in the situation is that there are schools which have not yet succumbed to the social studies' amazing "Now you see it—and now you don't!" technique in the presentation of the history of the United States.

This is not to suggest that the fusion treatment of American history, civics, sociology, economics, and what-have-you does not have its place in American education. It has. But it is of no value until and unless an orderly, chronological picture of American history is, at some point and some time in the educational ladder, presented in either the elementary or high school.

It is obvious that fusion, without something to fuse, is an impossibility. There is, for example, a similarity between the depression of 1837 and that of 1929-32. But the student can hardly recognize it unless he knows something about the depression of 1837 in its peculiar politico-economic setting. And this cannot be known in a historical vacuum. Obviously, the time-sequence panorama of American history is the first essential in an intelligent presentation of it.

And it is precisely this that the present development of the social-studies trend is eliminating.

In passing it might be noted that it is one thing to go back to the old textbook-memorizing days, and quite another to skip so rapidly from the present to the past and the past to the present that the student is confused and, in point of fact, develops no reference frame of events.

The truth is that a definite time-sequence presentation method must be insisted on if the student is to get any intelligible concept of American history. The past is not a mere appendage to the present. It is the basis and foundation of the present. And unless leaders in the social-studies movement wake up to the extent of the confusion and ignorance of our historical backgrounds, the present teaching techniques are producing in the secondary schools, they will face the wrath of an aroused public opinion.

Indeed, as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently noted: "If our educators cannot see what is wrong with this situation, laymen can. We are fighting a war to preserve the American way of life, and countless Americans do not know what their way of life is."

Is it possible that we must be reduced to the humiliation of having the Army take over where our schools have failed? The Army is already doing it.

Lt. Gen. Ben Lear, commander of the Second Army, has reported he found the boys under his command so ignorant of the elemental facts of American history that he set up classes to teach them. It is also significant that it is spokesmen of the Army, not the educators, who are including American history as one of the basic studies in the new wartime curriculum.

This, too, is the measure of our incapacity.

As Admiral Nimitz has said: "The zeal to defend our heritage is based, in the last analysis, on an understanding of its origin and development."

And this fundamental understanding our present social-studies technique is not supplying.

MANPOWER-UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFIT PAYMENTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have listened attentively to the remarks of my distinguished colleague [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] with relation to the problem of lack of education in America. At some future time I should like to comment on that subject. Suffice it to say that it seems to me that back of it all

is something which has existed in the past 10 or 15 years. We have thought it smart, and the American way of doing things, to discount industry, thrift, courage, and honesty, and the good old American trait of doing things on the basis of individual accomplishment. My memory goes back to articles by learned men discounting the great virtues of Lincoln, Washington, Jefferson, and other great Americans. Of course, they were not gods; but men have written books which deprive youth of the exaltation which comes from reading about men who stand for morality, courage, and principle. That is one of the reasons why youngsters who go to our colleges or universities have not seen fit to become acquainted with the fundamentals of American history.

But, Mr. President, I did not rise for that purpose. At the present time we are told that this Nation is facing the most severe manpower crisis in our history. I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate today some very illuminating figures on this subject.

In view of this fact, it is interesting to survey the unemployment compensation benefit payments on the basis of data reported by State agencies to the Social Security Board in Washington.

During the past calendar year, in a period when our production demands were the highest in history, from January 1 to December 31, 1942, unemployment compensation benefits in this land amounted to \$345,514,700. During the month of December 1942, unemployment benefits paid out amounted to

\$11,557,700, and it is estimated that the number of workers receiving benefits during December was 267,700.

Mr. President, I have not been able to secure the figures for January, February, and March of this year, but it is apparent that last December there were almost 300,000 men receiving unemployment compensation benefits, and this obviously is not the total extent of our unemployment. I realize that this represents a tremendous decrease from the unemployment of previous years. Nevertheless, it is appalling to discover a reservoir of some 300,000 unemployed.

At the present time there is increasing unemployment in the construction industry, and because of civilian curtailments there is unemployment in many other lines of endeavor.

I am not advised as to the extent of collaboration, if there is any, between the War Manpower Commission and the Social Security Board, and I have today written to the War Manpower Chairman, Mr. Paul V. McNutt, concerning this matter.

My purpose in addressing the Senate at this time is merely to draw the attention of this body to these figures, which I feel warrant serious study. I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated as a part of my remarks a chart of unemployment compensation benefits, which lists the benefits paid in each State. This information was supplied to me by the Social Security Board.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Unemployment compensation benefit payments, Dec. 31, 1942

[Preliminary data reported by State agencies—based on operations of central offices]

State	Benefits paid during December 1942 ¹	Estimated number of workers receiving benefits during December	Benefits paid during calendar year Jan. 1-Dec. 31, 1942 ²	Total benefits paid since first payable, through Dec. 31, 1942 ³
Total.....	\$11,557,700	267,700	\$345,514,700	\$2,092,335,476
Alabama.....	258,900	7,100	3,297,600	23,619,872
Alaska.....	1,100	(³)	148,400	1,316,782
Arizona.....	9,700	300	477,600	6,070,801
Arkansas.....	33,100	1,500	992,800	7,998,894
California.....	719,100	16,300	37,502,100	216,335,736
Colorado.....	9,200	200	826,300	10,679,974
Connecticut.....	73,100	1,000	3,233,900	28,351,581
Delaware.....	8,400	300	511,500	2,584,063
District of Columbia.....	44,500	500	1,158,000	8,473,881
Florida.....	166,600	4,900	4,718,000	20,070,886
Georgia.....	221,700	6,100	4,408,400	15,160,917
Hawaii.....	2,900	100	158,700	880,554
Idaho.....	3,500	100	832,000	6,864,599
Illinois.....	1,703,600	28,200	38,181,200	126,819,112
Indiana.....	284,300	6,700	9,647,000	51,423,490
Iowa.....	43,200	1,300	2,065,300	16,407,403
Kansas.....	40,500	1,300	1,816,700	7,991,295
Kentucky.....	106,400	3,800	2,530,900	14,782,905
Louisiana.....	197,600	4,600	5,161,800	28,966,597
Maine.....	68,000	2,300	1,189,700	13,754,067
Maryland.....	136,600	3,400	3,845,700	31,258,440
Massachusetts.....	310,600	7,800	11,833,400	106,963,104
Michigan.....	457,100	9,900	40,987,600	160,476,859
Minnesota.....	158,100	3,700	5,636,500	38,202,457
Mississippi.....	42,400	1,300	1,582,600	8,346,291
Missouri.....	440,800	11,000	8,140,000	26,238,024
Montana.....	7,700	200	1,226,400	7,686,370
Nebraska.....	12,600	400	972,800	5,413,118
Nevada.....	3,100	100	274,100	3,028,430
New Hampshire.....	28,100	800	799,200	8,454,979
New Jersey.....	667,200	15,800	17,878,800	63,853,674
New Mexico.....	4,200	100	502,000	3,731,821
New York.....	3,221,600	58,900	65,640,500	298,851,146
North Carolina.....	114,300	5,200	2,997,500	23,664,412
North Dakota.....	4,600	100	367,300	2,040,150
Ohio.....	323,800	8,400	14,408,100	74,780,197
Oklahoma.....	49,700	1,400	2,795,300	13,424,549

¹ Not adjusted for voided benefit checks.

² Adjusted for voided benefit checks.

³ Less than 100.

Unemployment compensation benefit payments, Dec. 31, 1942—Continued

(Preliminary data reported by State agencies—based on operations of central offices)

State	Benefits paid during December 1942	Estimated number of workers receiving benefits during December	Benefits paid during calendar year Jan. 1-Dec. 31, 1942	Total benefits paid since first payable, through Dec. 31, 1942
Oregon.....	\$50,700	1,100	\$1,778,300	\$18,303,176
Pennsylvania.....	622,700	14,700	15,060,900	208,772,506
Rhode Island.....	153,700	3,360	4,741,700	31,192,286
South Carolina.....	74,900	2,400	1,858,500	8,725,477
South Dakota.....	3,100	100	219,400	1,320,822
Tennessee.....	249,900	7,400	5,603,900	27,198,225
Texas.....	95,100	3,360	4,058,800	39,696,371
Utah.....	14,100	300	996,300	8,277,005
Vermont.....	13,800	400	316,400	3,083,100
Virginia.....	82,300	2,800	2,738,100	21,682,493
Washington.....	30,200	900	2,565,700	23,578,420
West Virginia.....	71,700	1,900	2,313,700	25,507,404
Wisconsin.....	115,900	2,700	4,133,400	26,651,933
Wyoming.....	1,700	(c)	353,900	3,378,248

^cLess than 100.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, figures which the Census Bureau released yesterday indicate that unemployment in March was about 1,000,000. Think of it. We are talking of putting 15,000,000 men into the military service, with 1,000,000 unemployed in March. That is a low point and represents a decline of about 2,600,000 from March of 1942. It is nearly 10,000,000 less than in 1937.

The March figure of 1,000,000 also represents a decrease of about 400,000 from the February estimate. This is a very sharp decline since February of this year. Apparently some economists and the Census Bureau itself regard this as a level not far above "the irreducible minimum." A great many economists place "minimum" unemployment at between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000.

The estimate of 1,000,000 does not cover unemployables, but it does include some persons temporarily unemployed in the process of transferring from one job to another. It also includes some seasonal workers.

Personally I am reluctant to accept the theory that there is any "minimum" unemployment. It is difficult to reconcile our staggering manpower requirements with the figure of 1,000,000 unemployed. Think of it. We are reaching into homes to take women with children, and yet we are told that there must be a minimum unemployment. The projected increase in the armed forces means that our current employment and production volume will be maintained only if large numbers of persons now classified as nonworkers will enter the labor forces.

Let me point out the significant fact that the civilian labor force declined by 300,000 between February and March. In other words, we cannot attribute the drop in unemployment to our employment programs.

The drop in the civilian labor force was confined entirely to men. It marked the eighth consecutive month in which the male labor force declined.

According to the Census Bureau, the number of women in the labor market remains unchanged at 15,600,000. The labor force in March of 1943 was estimated to be 52,000,000. That was 700,000 less than in March of 1941. In other words, our factories and our farms are

meeting wartime production requirements with a civilian-labor force which is less than pre-war levels.

Male employment between February and March dropped 100,000. The employment of women increased by 200,000. The net increase of 100,000 brings the total employment to about 51,000,000, and agricultural employment shows a gain of about 200,000 workers during the past month. That increase took place entirely among farm workers and undoubtedly resulted from military deferments of agricultural workers.

The estimates which the Census Bureau has made of unemployment are based on a representative cross-section survey. It covers approximately 25,000 families.

All these figures are very enlightening. They indicate that last month there were a million unemployed in this country, and they indicate that at the close of last year, of the total unemployed at that time, we were paying unemployment compensation benefits to almost 300,000 workers.

It seems to me that all of this points to one conclusion; namely, that it is high time for us to have made available all the expert recommendations regarding the manpower program which were supposed to have been made to the President recently. The normal peacetime estimates of the irreducible number of unemployed are obviously out of date today, and it is high time that we had a clearly defined, accurately charted program to absorb a reservoir of 1,000,000 workers.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Can the Senator advise us whether any State laws permit the payment of unemployment-insurance benefits to those who are suffering from injuries or illness?

Mr. WILEY. I suppose they do.

Mr. BONE. The figures would be much more significant if we had some indication of the extent to which those who received unemployment-compensation benefits were ill or had been injured at work, and were therefore entitled to unemployment-compensation benefits while they were away from work.

Mr. WILEY. I cannot say definitely. The figures have not been put on that basis. I have the figures pertaining to all the States. The significant thing is the large amount of money which is being paid out.

Mr. BONE. The figures as to injuries are appalling. The number of industrial accidents in the country is very great.

Mr. WILEY. I suppose that in most instances injuries would come under the workmen's compensation acts of the various States.

Mr. BONE. I assume they would, but I am wondering if in any State illness is brought within the bracket of personal injuries, for I suspect that in some States workmen's compensation laws are not in effect.

Mr. WILEY. I have concluded, Mr. President.

INSTRUCTION IN AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to support the resolution introduced by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. I do so because of what I have also read in the article which was referred to and read in part by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. One of the questions in the article appearing in the Sunday New York Times was "What Were the Original Thirteen Colonies?" Some of the students replied that the colonies included Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Nebraska. After I read that I was impelled to get in touch with some of the historians, and one of those whom I consulted was Robert Haskell Cory, Jr., one of the distinguished historians of this country. He told me that one of the reasons for the lack of knowledge on the part of some students was the low pay which was received by most of the educators throughout the country. I then got in touch with the National Education Association and found that altogether there are 894,000 classroom teachers, principals, and supervisors in the public schools. I found that since the present war started 37,000 teachers have left their profession and are now engaged in war industry, farming, and other businesses. I further discovered that, as applied to the salaries of teachers, 40 teachers in every 100, or about 360,000 in all, are being paid less than \$1,200 for the school year 1942-43. Nearly 8 in every 100, or approximately 66,000 in all, are being paid less than \$600 for the present school year.

Low salaries for teachers are typical in the Southern States but they are by no means limited to that region. More than 169,000 of the teachers receiving less than \$1,200 a year are outside the Southeastern and Southwestern States. Fifteen thousand receiving less than \$600 a year are likewise in States other than Southern States.

There are about 61,000 Negro teachers in the Southeastern and Southwestern States where schools are segregated, and salaries differentiated. About 53,000 of these Negro teachers are paid less than \$1,200 per year. About 30,000 are paid less than \$600 a year.

Only 2 of the 48 States report that no teachers are being paid less than \$1,200 for the year 1942-43. Nearly 15,000 teachers in Pennsylvania—23 percent—are being paid less than \$1,200 for the year's work in 1942-43. The percentage is even higher in Illinois, where about 30 percent, or some 14,000 teachers, receive less than \$1,200 a year.

Twenty-six of the 48 States are employing teachers at less than \$600 a year.

Mr. President, I was intensely interested when I further ascertained that the amount of money spent in 1938 for alcohol was \$3,444,000,000; for tobacco, \$1,722,000,000; for movies, \$1,433,000,000; cosmetics and chewing gum, \$435,000,000, or a total of \$7,639,000,000 spent for luxuries.

The total amount spent on education during the same period was \$2,564,000,000, or 33.6 percent as much as was spent on luxuries in the United States during 1938.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I desire to occupy the floor for a moment to comment on the story of education which has been unfolded to the Senate today. It is one which should burn itself into the consciousness of the members of boards of higher curricula in all our States where such institutions are maintained.

We are presently engaged in the greatest war in human history, a war in which we shall probably and tragically pour out libations of blood which will stagger the imagination of the world. We are saying to ourselves, and to our boys who are making these sacrifices, that they are fighting to preserve all the worth-while things in our American system and our American way of life. So when we read this most astounding document it comes as a very rude shock to discover that the magnificent historical traditions of America have been obscured, and are no longer bright and shining inspirations to the students in American high schools.

We are telling our boys that they are fighting for great historical principles enshrined in our national life. Yet, according to this story, which is well verified in the experience of almost all of us, the students in our high schools, as well as those who are entering our colleges, have all too little acquaintance with the magnificent history and historical figures of our country. We are telling our boys that they are fighting for these principles, and yet many do not understand what they are. We have seen enshrined in our national life a hatred of many evils—hell-born evils—and we wrote an iconoclastic thesis against them in fierce whirlwinds of fire. Men have died to keep the infant Republic from being strangled in its cradle and it is remarkable how many boys and girls, unfortunately, do not know the beautiful story of the man whose valor and genius carved a nation out of a wilderness.

Are we asking our boys to fight for something they do not understand? If so, it is a sad picture. We have a system of education in this country which is lacking in that it has robbed them of

a knowledge of the most beautiful things in our American life. It seems utterly fantastic to me that a boy or a girl should not have an understanding of the rich and full meaning of American history.

I think Mr. Fraser and his associates have made a worth-while contribution in bringing to our attention this rather tragic picture of the failure of our school system to sufficiently teach American history.

The Senator from North Dakota referred to the financial status of school teachers. But obviously, if they graduated from high schools and universities, and lacked knowledge of the history of this country they cannot teach history. It is a vicious circle. I do not know what the Senate or the House, or the two bodies together, may or can do about it, but it is a challenging picture of failure. We are telling the world that we are fighting for our own magnificent traditions and for all of the beautiful things which have been enshrined in the fabric of American life, and yet millions of our own boys and girls may never come to appreciate their significance or cost. Certainly we owe it to the boys and girls coming on to bring about a change.

PREVENTION OF DEDUCTIONS IN DETERMINING PARITY OR COMPARABLE PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—VETO

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (S. 660) to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	Overton
Austin	Guffey	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reed
Bankhead	Hawkes	Revercomb
Barkley	Hayden	Reynolds
Bone	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Holman	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McCarran	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Van Nuys
Danaher	McNary	Wagner
Davis	Maloney	Wallgren
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Murdock	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr.

GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on an inspection tour of military camps.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent, holding hearings in the West on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate Small Business Enterprises.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained in New Hampshire.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business as a member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I regret that it is necessary to submit my views on this at a time when I know a great many Senators are going to leave the floor at the lunch hour. I also regret that some Senators who deliberately voted for the passage of this bill, and who are now said to be on the other side of the issue, are not present to hear a fair discussion of the measure. I state that especially for the reason that there have been so many misrepresentations about the effects of the bill that it is a pity, Mr. President, as I see it, that Members of this body should be misguided by representations which are not really justified, in my opinion, and very largely upon anonymous statements of the effects of the bill made by somebody in a department who may or may not be responsible for the figures which are presented.

In the first place, I wish to say that it is not my personal bill, if that is of any significance. This bill was sponsored by the four largest farm organizations in America. They requested me to introduce and handle it. With my knowledge of the subject, and being in absolute accord with their viewpoint and with the purposes of the bill, I was glad to take that action. When the bill was previously before the Senate I put into the Record letters from the four outstanding farm organizations, showing their support of the measure. A day or two later I received a telegram from the fifth farm organization, one which does not usually cooperate with the other four, namely, the National Farmers' Union, giving unqualified support to the bill. I have the telegram here. I have not heard from them since the President vetoed the bill. I want to make it clear that the statement they sent to me at the time when

the bill was previously under consideration was their position then. I do not know what their position is now, whether they still favor the bill or not. Let me read the telegram from the National Farmers' Union, since it has not heretofore been read into the RECORD of the Senate, for the reason that I received it the day after the Senate passed the bill. I think it is well, at least, for the public to understand the attitude of this farm organization in addition to the other four at a time when so much pressure was not to be resorted to to sustain the veto of the President. The telegram is signed by James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union, and reads:

We are tremendously pleased and encouraged by your effective work which resulted in the Senate's approval yesterday by an almost unanimous vote to protect agriculture against ceilings imposed by the Office of Price Administration at less than parity prices. We have always contended that parity prices were to provide parity of income, and soil and conservation payments were to compensate the farmer for taking land out of production and preserving the soil.

I also had a telegram at the same time sent by the National Farmers' Union by James G. Patton, president, and by M. W. Thatcher, vice chairman, National Executive Council of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives. It is practically the same as the telegram I have just read, and in order to save reading it I will ask that it be published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., February 27, 1943.

Hon. JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
Senate Office Building:

We are tremendously pleased and encouraged by your effective work which resulted in the Senate's approval yesterday by an almost unanimous vote to protect agriculture against ceilings imposed by the Office of Price Administration at less than parity prices. We have always contended that parity payments were to provide parity of income and soil-conservation payments were to compensate the farmers for taking land out of production and preserving the soil.

NATIONAL FARMERS' UNION,
JAMES G. PATTON, President.
M. W. THATCHER,

Vice Chairman, National Executive Council, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, since the veto of the bill by the President I have received a letter signed by the other four farm organizations, dated April 3, which I shall read. It is as follows:

To the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

We urge Congress to pass the Bankhead bill over the President's veto. At stake is the basic issue of whether we shall have government by law or by Executive decree.

With that statement I am in the fullest accord. I continue the reading:

The amount of money involved is relatively small. The principle involved is fundamental.

In the Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, the Congress stipulated that ceilings on farm products should not be set below parity prices to farmers. This provision of the law has been nullified by Executive decree.

In our opinion it is the duty of the Congress to see that the law is carried out. This can be accomplished by passage of the Bankhead bill over the veto. Enactment of this measure would permit the farmer to obtain parity in the market place, instead of being forced to depend upon subsidies from the Public Treasury. Farmers do not want, and never have wanted, subsidies when they could obtain parity prices.

Unfortunately the issue has been clouded by assertions that the Bankhead bill will seriously increase the dangers of inflation. These assertions are based on misleading and distorted figures. Any increase in the cost of farm commodities which might result from passage of the measure would be so small as to have little, if any, effect on the cost of food to the consumer.

It is most unfortunate that again and again the American farmer has been attacked and accused of responsibility for inflation. It is apparent that once more agriculture is to be used as the whipping-boy to further appease the wage demands of organized labor and to divert attention from the real source of inflation. This is seriously undermining the morale of the farmer and impairing his heroic efforts to produce to the utmost of his capacity. Not only farmers but the general public are becoming increasingly concerned over the ability of American agriculture to produce adequate food and fiber under present Government policies.

So that the public may know where the true blame for inflation lies, we submit the following facts based on Government records:

1. While American farmers constitute more than 22 percent of our population, they receive less than 10 percent of our national income.
2. In 1942, farm income had increased only \$1,000,000,000 over the peak figure of the last World War, while nonfarm income increased more than \$55,000,000,000.
3. Farm prices today are 10 percent below farm prices prevailing during the last World War. Hourly pay of industrial workers is nearly two and a half times greater than the peak hourly rates of World War No. 1.

I ask the attention of my colleagues, particularly to the following statement:

4. Today the average nonfarm family is paying a lower percentage of its income for food than at any time during the past 30 years. Today 22 percent of the average nonfarm family income is spent for food compared to 38 percent at the peak of World War No. 1.

Permit me to digress from the reading of this statement to say that these figures are taken from statements released from time to time by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture, one of which, and the latest of which, I have here among my papers. I continue to read:

There is, therefore, absolutely no justification for organized labor to use either the Bankhead bill or the cost of food as an excuse for demanding further wage increases. In view of the grave food shortage now confronting the country, we believe it is time to stop kicking the farmer around and to fix the blame for inflation where it properly belongs.

Agriculture has always urged that stability could be maintained only through a fair balance between industrial wages and agricultural prices. Had labor and the administration agreed to this, today the cost of living would be substantially lower. Feeling that passage of the Bankhead bill will still leave a disparity between agricultural prices and industrial wages, and therefore does not justify labor's demands for higher pay, we believe it to be the duty of labor to join with us in an

honest attempt to reach the fair balance necessary, to the end that America may win the war and write an enduring peace.

Yours very sincerely,

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
A. S. GOSS, Master.
AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
EDWARD A. O'NEAL, President.
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES,
CHARLES C. TEAGUE, President.
NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS' FEDERATION,
CHARLES W. HOLMAN, Secretary.

Mr. President, this statement, signed by these four great farm organizations, presents a good picture, an accurate picture, broadly speaking, of the facts so far as I know them to be, and I urge the earnest attention of Senators to the representations, statements, and arguments made by this group of representatives of organized agriculture in this country.

Mr. President, I also have a letter from Mr. C. C. Teague, president of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, one of the greatest farm organizations in the United States so far as membership is concerned. I shall not read the letter, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
FARMER COOPERATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1943.

Re President's veto, Bankhead bill, S. 660.
To Members of Congress:

GENTLEMEN: We have just held a 3-day session of the executive committee of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, an organization with a membership of more than 2,000,000 farmers distributed in every State and almost every county. Members of the executive committee came from all parts of the country. There does not exist a more able, representative, or patriotic group of men connected with agriculture.

They came together, not because of a profit motive, but because of their grave concern over the serious national food situation.

Each of them expressed the conviction that there was impending a crisis that promised to be calamitous in the production of the foods essential to feeding our armed forces, assisting our allies, and supplying our civilian population on even a greatly restricted diet.

They were unanimously of the opinion that under the present policies of Government the minimum requirements of these essential foods would not be produced for the following reasons:

1. Before the establishment of price controls and the Little Steel formula, labor unions, supported by the Government and the device of cost-plus contracts, had raised the wages of common labor in many cases to double that of the pre-war period. Farmers, in order to get labor, have, in many cases, had to pay even higher wages than those paid in defense plants and still cannot get the necessary labor for production and harvest.

2. One-third to as high as one-half of the agricultural laborers and farmers in many areas have been taken from agriculture into defense plants and into the armed forces. The work performed by these workers cannot, except in small measure, be done by inexperienced women and children.

3. Under priority rulings material could not be obtained for machinery, repair parts, replacements, and other essential farm supplies.

4. Ill-considered application of ceiling prices has caused many maladjustments in production and distribution.

All of these conditions are discouraging and restricting production.

In many high-cost crops the risk is so great that farmers will not plant without assurance of a labor supply and a price that will at least return to them their out-of-pocket expense.

Since the establishment of price ceilings, it has been the policy of the administration to hold down the price of food.

The Bankhead bill (S. 660) means little in the way of increased prices to farmers or increased costs to consumers. It does, we believe, carry out a part of the policy which Congress wrote into the Price Control Act and which was nullified by Executive order. There is a principle involved which we believe demands the support of this legislation by every Member of Congress. The time has come when parity prices or prices to farmers as an end in themselves is past. The dominant consideration in determining the level at which price ceilings are imposed should be: What will be the effect on supplies? Farm prices should be established primarily to get the right foods in the right quantities.

Ceiling or maximum prices should be used to safeguard the public from inflationary and speculative prices, but prices necessary to cover the costs of producing a supply of foods sufficient to provide reasonably adequate diets for the armed forces, our allies, and the civilian population cannot properly be called "inflationary prices"; they are necessary prices—necessary to cover costs, necessary to provide a reasonably adequate food supply, necessary to keep foods flowing through normal distributive channels rather than to a select few via the "black market," necessary that everyone may have enough of something to eat even though it may not be just what he'd like to eat.

We urge the support of the Bankhead bill (S. 660) in overriding the President's veto as one step in the direction of the assurance of an adequate production of essential foods.

Sincerely yours,

C. C. TEAGUE, *President.*

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I read one paragraph from the letter which I have just had inserted in the RECORD:

The Bankhead bill (S. 660) means little in the way of increased prices to farmers or increased costs to consumers. It does, we believe, carry out a part of the policy which Congress wrote into the Price Control Act and which was nullified by Executive order. There is a principle involved which we believe demands the support of this legislation by every Member of Congress. The time has come when parity prices, or prices to farmers, as an end in themselves is past. The dominant consideration in determining the level at which price ceilings are imposed should be: What will be the effect on supplies? Farm prices should be established primarily to get the right foods in the right quantities.

I was deeply impressed with that statement, because it is in line with my philosophy, that, instead of having controversies about the difference in the cost of beets, squash, and cucumbers, or even major commodities, the great outstanding proposition, from the standpoint of the welfare of our country, is the matter of production, quantity production, production sufficient to meet the require-

ments of our people, the armed forces at home and abroad, and to fulfill the promises made to our allies through the lend-lease program.

Permit me again to call attention, as I did on a former occasion, to the views held by Mr. Herbert Hoover on the subject. Mr. Hoover has had a wider experience than any other living man with the subject of food supplies and food distribution during periods of emergency. Whether or not we agree with Mr. Hoover's economic philosophy, we all know that his experience and his record of success as food administrator of this country and distributor of food in foreign lands was the primary factor in advancing him in the consideration of the American people for the office of the Presidency of the United States, which was later bestowed upon him. Are we to disregard the judgment of such an experienced man merely because we do not agree with all his economic views? I submit that in a trying time it is well for us to take advantage of the experience and the judgment of such a man on this subject. When the first price-control bill was under consideration in the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, Mr. Hoover said that the time would come when the American people would be more interested in the subject of floors under prices so as to bring about adequate production than they would be about price ceilings.

Senators, we all know it to be a fundamental principle of economy that prices are largely fixed by the law of supply and demand, and the chief factor in any price fixing is the quantity of commodities offered on the market. The best way to hold down prices of any commodities, and especially of agricultural commodities, is to produce in ample quantities, and the ample supply will in itself automatically bring about fair and reasonable prices.

I will illustrate my point by referring to watermelons. Let us say a load of watermelons a day comes to a town in which the people consume a load of watermelons a day. Let us assume that a little later two or three loads of watermelons a day come to the same town, in which there are the same number of consumers. Down goes the price. On the other hand, let us suppose that the watermelon producers carry their melons to some other market, or that their production of melons is short for reasons beyond their control; is there anyone who does not know how rapidly the price rises because the number of melons is less than the requirements to supply the market?

So it is with all agricultural production. It is not only desirable from every standpoint during wartimes to have an ample production of food, but it is the best way known to man to bring about reasonable and fair prices for the commodities.

Mr. President, let me now move to another subject. The bill, as Senators know, is the result of an Executive order issued by the President promptly after the approval of the last Price Control or Stabilization Act, under which the Presi-

dent directed that all parity payments, all soil-conservation payment, and all subsidies of every kind be deducted in fixing both the parity prices and the ceiling prices of commodities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the Executive order providing for the stabilization of the national economy, to which I have referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The excerpt is as follows:

TITLE IV. PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

2. In establishing, maintaining, or adjusting maximum prices for agricultural commodities or for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or in substantial part from any agricultural commodity, appropriate deductions shall be made from parity price or comparable price for payments made under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, parity payments made under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and governmental subsidies.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In his order the President said:

Appropriate deductions shall be made from parity price—

Not parity income—

from parity price or comparable price for payments made under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, parity payments made under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and governmental subsidies.

The deductions are to be made—

in establishing, maintaining, or adjusting maximum prices for agricultural commodities or for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or in substantial part from any agricultural commodity.

That order was dated October 6, 1942, 4 days after the approval of the act.

Mr. President, I am approaching the subject in the same spirit that the President said he was approaching it, when he said he gave due credit to those who differed with him, and that he expected the same treatment from those who differed with him. I am approaching the subject in that way. I fundamentally differ with the President on this subject, and unfortunately it is not the first time, though I have not often differed with him. But, Mr. President, the Price Control or Stabilization Act had just been passed by this body, after a full discussion of its provisions, and no part of that act or of the first Price Control Act received more attention and more consideration than the provision fixing the ceiling price on agricultural commodities. Every Senator present knows that to be true.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will it disturb the very able Senator from Alabama if I make an observation?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No. I shall be glad to have the Senator make it.

Mr. McNARY. I think some confusion has arisen concerning the agricultural commodities to which either the Bankhead bill or the President's veto of that bill applies. Is it not true that the

bill deals only with corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It does not even deal with cotton.

Mr. McNARY. We are dealing with the so-called basic commodities named and defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator from Oregon goes a little further than the bill went. I may say to the able Senator that there are only two commodities directly involved, and those are corn and wheat. There has been no effort to change the status of any of the other agricultural commodities.

Mr. McNARY. We will not quarrel on that subject. I simply say that speaking of the application of the measure it could only refer to the five basic commodities.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. It refers to only two, however, because they are a little below the parity price.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I want to make clear. Let me observe that when there is talk about inflation, which I shall discuss in my own time, the so-called basic commodities, five in number, produce only about one-third of the gross income of the farmers of the country.

Mr. BANKHEAD. So far as my information goes, I think the Senator's figures are correct.

Mr. President, directly involved in the question before the Senate are the statements made by radio commentators and other molders of public opinion who in the last few days have been indulging in great activity and have in large measure tried to create the impression that the increases in the prices of cucumbers, beets, peas, turnip greens, radishes, onions, and potatoes have occurred because of the contemplated operation of the Bankhead bill. Many persons believe that the apparently excessive prices which they are required to pay at retail stores for the rarities and delicacies which many of us enjoy have been caused by the Bankhead bill. That thought has stirred them up. They honestly think so. They think the Bankhead bill has caused increases in the prices of everything in the grocery stores, including canned goods, preserves, fruits, and vegetables. I have heard arguments to that effect. I have received a letter from a friend at home saying that the people there were under the impression that the bill covers everything the farmer produces, and will cause a rise in prices. He said they believe that because the radio commentators have continually said so, without distinguishing in any way or giving to the public the fact that really nothing except corn and wheat is involved. The impression the radio commentators have created is not a fair one.

I am sure that all other Members of the Senate have heard such remarks made by commentators, and I know they have read the editorials in the anti-farmer metropolitan press denouncing, without rhyme or reason, and without any distinction, the Bankhead Act as

one which was likely to turn loose the forces of inflation, and result in a rapidly climbing price level for the food the people must have.

How can the poor farmers, who, to a large extent, are unorganized, refute those great media of publicity to the people? They have no way to do so. If they cannot find enough stanch friends in this body to repudiate the untruthful and exaggerated statements made time after time that mislead the people, they are lost; they are helpless. The American form of government is helpless when a great mass of people, such as our farmers, are imposed upon on the basis of untrue, prejudicial statements, and when the farmers have no way to act in the face of such a situation except through their Senators and Representatives, who do not get much publicity when they are defending the cause of the farmers.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator just referred to the tendency toward inflation by price advances of possibly 6 or 8 cents that would be possible under the proposed act. As a matter of fact, in the wheat market, for instance, the price of wheat has declined approximately 6 cents during the past week or 10 days, while the question has been before the Congress.

Mr. BANKHEAD. During the time of the prospect of the passage of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me ask the Senator if he has seen any sign of any terrible deflation taking place because of the drop in the market—not a drop of 1 cent in the price of a loaf of bread, but a drop of even one-tenth of 1 cent?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If such a drop has occurred, my grocer has not found out about it, and neither have the diligent newspaper reporters.

Mr. President, I intend to discuss the constitutional question, because I regard it as fundamental, and I shall return to it.

Now, as to corn, let me say that I consulted the Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, who has had long experience. As a civil-service employee he has served under various administrations for years. He has the confidence of everyone associated with him and of everyone who knows him, and he has had greater experience than any of those connected with the O. P. A. ever will have. I called him and asked him what effect the passage of the Bankhead bill would have in terms of increased cost to consumers. He said that, so far as corn is concerned, the effect would be negligible. The people do not eat much corn; and yet all the talk in opposition to the bill is about the food supplies of the people. I am talking about corn.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. In just a moment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I simply wanted to point out to the Senator that the reference was to field corn.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; field corn used for both humans and animals. People do not eat much field corn. They eat a

few roasting ears when they can get them.

Mr. TYDINGS. But those are not involved in this question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No.

The Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics said that not much of the corn raised this year would be consumed this year. Of course, he was talking about corn used for feed. The livestock-raising season is approaching. The supply of corn for feed for livestock has in large measure been laid in; and he said that as to corn the increased cost to consumers this year because of the effect of the Bankhead bill would be negligible. However, if we read many of the daily newspapers represented by our friends in the press gallery, and especially if we read the farmer-hating newspapers of Washington—the Post and the Star—we would think that the bill is about to bring on a regular cyclone and tornado of inflation.

What about wheat? Wheat is not directly involved. An order affecting wheat has not been issued. An order has been issued only as to corn. That commodity was picked out. I do not know whether that was done to test the matter or why it was done. An order was issued as to flour, and I have been advised that the order did not reflect parity on wheat. I am sure that the matter will later be discussed by the Senator from Kansas, which is the greatest wheat-producing State of the Union.

At any rate, there was no direct order on wheat. So far as the present activity of O. P. A. is concerned, so far as Executive orders under the Price Stabilization Act are concerned, corn is the only commodity which has been directly operated upon or affected by the Administration's program. Wheat has been affected only indirectly.

Now, let me ask the Members of the Senate why we should become stampeded by a false alarm of inflation.

Why should we run to cover? There are reports in circulation to the effect that a number of able and conscientious Senators who deliberately voted for the passage of this bill are very greatly disturbed by newspaper and radio statements, and by telephone calls which are coming to them from sources about which we might think a little later.

The difference between the present market price and the parity price of wheat is about 8½ cents a bushel. Only about 15 percent of the corn crop is cash corn. The rest is fed on the farms. Only about 600,000,000 bushels of corn are bought by consumers for feed and other purposes. The cash corn crop represents only about 600,000,000 bushels. The figures were given to me by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Those are the figures not for this year but for next year, a full, normal year. It can be seen how small are the figures which it is alleged would result in a run-away inflation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The figure for corn is about \$50,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have the figure before me. It is \$51,000,000. I thank the Senator. There would be an increase in the purchase price of cash corn of only \$51,000,000. The cash corn represents about 600,000,000 bushels. Seventy-eight Members of the Senate voted for the bill.

With respect to wheat the difference is somewhat larger. At the present time the difference between the parity price of wheat and the market price is about 20 cents a bushel. I do not know whether or not wheat will ever be involved. It is not involved now, but many persons are acting as though wheat and all the other grains and agricultural commodities were involved. The difference between the present market price and the parity price is only 20 cents a bushel. With a 700,000,000-bushel supply of wheat, assuming that the whole crop were subjected to sale at a figure representing the present difference between the parity price and the market price, the difference would be \$140,000,000, making a total of \$190,000,000 for wheat and corn, which are the basis—if there is any basis—for the cry of threatened inflation.

Let us see whether statements which have been made constitute a genuine argument against the unorganized as well as the organized farmers. A year or so ago the wages of railroad employees were increased. The Board first gave them about \$200,000,000. They protested, and it was currently stated that the President thought they ought to have more. Finally the amount was raised, and the result was that they received an increase of approximately \$300,000,000. Did anybody cry inflation?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator might point out that in connection with corn and wheat, as I recall, the parity payments amounted to approximately the figure which the Senator has mentioned—namely, \$190,000,000. Such payments, if made through a subsidy, would be as inflationary as would payments made by the consumer.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am in full accord with the Senator's views on that question. As I view the situation, they would be more inflationary. When the difference is paid out of the Treasury with borrowed money, as the Government is now obliged to do, who will dispute the assertion that that is much more inflationary than letting the farmer get the same amount of money from the consumer in the market place? I take it that no one will deny that assertion.

The opponents of the bill wish to cling to the most inflationary method that could be devised to carry on their program, rather than to let the farmers get their parity prices in the market places, when the pockets of the people are bulging with money.

As has been stated, only 22 percent of the income of the average family is used for the purchase of food.

Mr. DOWNEY. The figure is 32 percent.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the figure for industrial workers. There is quite a difference. The revised figure for industrial workers is 28 or 29 percent. I am talking about the average family. In the case of industrial workers, only 28 or 29 percent of their income is devoted to the purchase of food—the smallest percentage of income for the past 30 or 40 years, if not in the history of the country.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Does not that figure include all food? It is not limited to the cost of the food commodities affected by the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It covers all food consumed at the tables of workers.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The percentage would be very much smaller if it applied only to the commodities affected by the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes. The percentage on corn alone, or on corn and wheat, would be so small as to require an expert mathematician to figure it.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator has been referring to the alleged inflationary increases which would result from the passage of the bill. He called attention to some figures which are very significant in one sense, and very insignificant in another sense.

I think it would be pertinent to call attention to the fact that yesterday Congress completed action on a Federal pay bill and sent it to the White House for signature. The bill provides for an increase of \$563,000,000 a year in the Federal pay roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I thank the Senator for bringing that to my attention. I had intended to refer to it, because I brought out the comparison when the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] was obtaining passage of the bill relating to postal employees. That was the same day on which the so-called Pace bill was recommitted to the committee. It went off the calendar for the time being. Promptly afterward, on the same day, the junior Senator from New York obtained consideration of the bill to increase the pay of postal employees.

While he had the floor I asked him to tell us the total amount of increases within the past few months in the pay of civil service employees. He began to figure one and then another. Finally I asked him if the increases did not average approximately \$300 to each employee, and he said they averaged between \$250 and \$300. Then it developed—and he agreed—that more than 2,000,000 civil service employees were participating in that program. I do not object to it. I am not mentioning it for critical purposes; but more than 2,000,000 Federal employees are participating in that program.

Just as we dismissed temporarily consideration of the farmer's costs, the admission was made on the floor of the Senate by the authors of the bill that

an increase of \$600,000,000 in money to be spent had been voted. Whoever heard a word suggested here that the increases would be inflationary? No; the beneficiaries were not farmers. But when the farmers come, they receive different treatment, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], who sits by my side, knows full well.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the question of parity, let me ask if it is his understanding that, under the present law, the President has the authority, if he wishes to exercise it, to stop parity payments on the crops which the Senator has heretofore mentioned?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, that is not exactly the situation. The law provides what shall happen without the necessity of the President's action. Two years ago, at the instance of the President, there was included in the annual supply bill for the Department of Agriculture—the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and I took part in having the language inserted—a provision pertaining to that point. I intended to come to that.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Senator will not be diverted by my question. I thought he had left the subject of parity for the time being.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I really had not come to it, but I shall come to it directly; and I shall read the provision to which I have referred, which appears in the appropriation act. I never knew why the administration was not satisfied with it. It had the provision put in the act, and it is still in it. The provision reads as follows:

If the sum of the prevailing basic loan rate * * * or the average farm price, whichever is the higher, for the crop year 1942 and the applicable rate of the payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the 1942 agricultural conservation program and the parity payments herein provided, exceed an amount sufficient to increase the farmers' returns to parity prices, parity payments shall be so adjusted as to provide a return to producers which is equal to but not greater than parity price.

Mr. President, we included that provision in the agricultural appropriation bill in 1941. We had no agreement with the President about it, but to be sure that we were acting in good faith, we included it in the appropriation bill for 1942, and that provision is now the law. It has been in the law for 2 years. Appropriations for parity are cut off and stopped whenever the amount received by the farmer, either in the market place or under a loan plus soil-conservation payments, reaches the parity level. Then parity appropriations may no longer be paid.

Instead of regulating the farmer by Executive decree or proclamation, if the Senate wishes to eliminate either the parity or the soil-conservation payments, there is the regular constitutional and legal process for doing it. If it is desired to carry the matter further, Congress has the power to do it, but no one ought to undertake to do it except the Congress of the United States.

There was much controversy about the soil-conservation payments. It developed that the Congress was unwilling to eliminate those payments, because they were counted, in order to figure the amount of money a farmer received, in determining whether or not his parity appropriations should be cut off, but they were reduced, because that money was appropriated for soil conservation, soil-improvement practices, to prevent erosion, to rotate crops, to pay a farmer, for instance, for some reason or other, for following certain soil practices, for the discontinuance for a year or so of production, so that the amount of his production was diminished.

In carrying out the soil-conservation program adopted by the Department of Agriculture, Congress was unwilling to count the payments, but after a long controversy it did not permit cutting off soil-conservation payments, figuring, as it was argued, that they were made in the interest of future generations, that as rural population decreased and city population increased, it became more important to have a higher yield per acre on the cultivated land, not only for today, but for 50 and 100 years from now, when possibly the fertility of the soil would be of more importance even than it is now.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. While the distinguished Senator is discussing the question of parity, am I to understand that it is his view that the Executive order of the President would permit the O. P. A. to fix a ceiling under parity on any of the five commodities?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I thank the Senator for his inquiry. I am glad my attention has been brought back to that subject.

I have the price-control bills before me. I now wish to come to the real, fundamental question in this situation, so far as I am concerned. The question is simple and plain. Because of an emergency situation, or one which it deems to be an emergency situation, shall Congress abandon the American processes in the matter of constitutional government? That, of course, leads back to a discussion of whether or not this act gave the President the power to do what he did, which was to change parity prices, by subtractions, and thereby change ceiling prices by reducing parity prices. Was that ever in the mind of any Member of the Senate? It is recent history. Every Senator now present, who was here at the time of the debate on the subject, knows that such an idea was in no way contemplated, or even mentioned on the floor of the Senate. It was not mentioned in the conference committee, of which I happened to be a member. All Senators need to do is to read the law. It is so plain that a wayfaring man can understand it. There is no ambiguity about it. There is no uncertainty about it.

Let me read from section 3 of the Price Control Act, which is the agricultural commodity section.

Now listen:

No maximum price shall be established or maintained—

That is what we call the ceiling price—for any agricultural commodity under the authority of this act—

Does it stop there? No. or otherwise—

Those words were deliberately put in: I helped to put them in. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY] I am sure will remember the discussion, because there had been intimations and suggestions made as to what might be done. So those words were written in. They are not found in many statutes.

No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity under authority of this act or otherwise below a price which will reflect to the producers of agricultural commodities the higher of the following prices, as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture—

Not by the O. F. A., not by the executive departments of the Government, but in the old, long established way followed by the Department of Agriculture, which has been publishing month by month the parity prices for practically all agricultural commodities. So, in order to make sure that there should be no transgression of this law, and that there should be no circumvention of it by anybody who wanted to have something in the law that was not included in it, we deliberately inserted the words "or otherwise." The law continues:

1. The parity price for such commodity (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials) or, in case a comparable price has been determined for such commodity under and in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, such comparable price (adjusted in the same manner), or—

It proceeds—

2. The highest price received by such producers for such commodity between January 19 and September 15, 1942.

And so forth. It will be noted that no price can be fixed under the act, "or otherwise," below the parity price of such commodity as ascertained and published by the Secretary of Agriculture. Whether that is a wise provision, Mr. President, is not the question before the Senate today. It was before the Senate on a previous occasion, and what I have read expresses the very last word of the Congress on the subject.

The amendment to the Emergency Price Control Act, from which I have quoted, went to the White House; it was approved, and within four or five days the order was issued with no change intervening in the law, which provided that no price below the parity price as ascertained and published by the Secretary of Agriculture, shall be fixed.

The section of the law from which I have quoted is in absolute conflict with the Executive order issued by the President, who proceeded to establish parity prices for the purpose of ceiling prices, not as proclaimed by the Secretary of Agriculture, not in line with the limitation that the price must not be below parity. Deliberately, the President himself issued the order and fixed in the case of corn and in the case of processed flour

produced from wheat, a parity price below the regular, lawful parity price as published and proclaimed by the Secretary of Agriculture every month for a long time before the order was issued, and every month since it has been issued. I call the attention of the Senate to another thing.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McNARY. I do not feel that the very able Senator has precisely answered my inquiry.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall be glad to have the Senator restate his question.

Mr. McNARY. I do not want to force the issue if the Senator is prepared to explain the matter later. I rose a few moments ago to inquire—and to me it is very important in the decision of this question, and it comes now with particular application, because the Senator has just read from the Price Control Act—if, under the Executive order, it is the opinion of the able Senator that the President can fix a price under parity?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think he has no sort of authority to take such action, if that is the question the Senator is asking.

Mr. McNARY. Let me give an illustration, if I may. I do not desire to consume too much of the Senator's time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator may take all the time he pleases; I shall not hold the floor much longer.

Mr. McNARY. Suppose that the parity on wheat was a dollar and a half a bushel and the current or market price was \$1.30, and under the basic act we add to the \$1.30 by an appropriation of money benefit payments and conservation payments to bring the price up to \$1.50 for the farmer; does the Senator think that by Executive order, the President could fix the price of wheat at the current market value of \$1.30?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think the President had no power to fix a parity, and, therefore, a ceiling price, at any point below the regularly established parity price for the commodity, regardless of income from other sources to the farmer, for we are not dealing with income.

Mr. McNARY. I think the Senator is unquestionably right in his answer based on the law, but the Senator's bill having been vetoed, suppose the veto should be sustained, would the Senator then believe that a price could be fixed by O. P. A. under the ceiling?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think O. P. A. or anybody else would have any legal right to fix any price other than the parity prices proclaimed by the Department of Agriculture. I think any other action would be a usurpation of power and without justification in the law.

Mr. McNARY. I quite agree with the able Senator, but I assumed from what he said a little while ago that he was laboring under the theory that if we sustained the veto, and the Bankhead bill should fail, the President could fix or the O. P. A. could fix a ceiling under parity?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is perfectly clear to me that there would be no legal right to do it, but what they have done they

could do again, and include other commodities, so far as that is concerned, if the Senate and the Congress should not override the veto. It seems to me that our failure to override the veto would give them full liberty of action to make any orders the President might see fit along the line of ceiling prices.

Mr. McNARY. Probably I am having difficulty in making myself clear to the very able Senator. Does he share the view that it is possible, and might be likely, that the President would reduce below parity the ceiling price of any agricultural commodities?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That would be in line with the action in this case. That is all I can say to the Senator. The President would be released to do it again if he wanted to do so if we should fail to override his veto.

Mr. McNARY. So the Senator's particular contention is that if we should stand by this law the farmer would be assured that he would get the parity price?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is exactly correct; and he would have confidence that in the future he could plant his crop and make his arrangements with that understanding.

Mr. McNARY. I think I understand the Senator. One of his points is that he desires to remove any fear that the President might reduce the price and place a ceiling which would be below parity.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. REED. I desire to interrupt the Senator from Alabama for a moment upon the point he has been discussing. This body passed the Bankhead bill by a vote of 78 to 2, because it involved a fundamental principle. When the conference report was brought in, it was adopted unanimously, without a roll call.

If the President's veto shall be sustained, what protection will the farmer and the farm States have against any action the President and the administration might desire to take, regardless of whether there was the slightest semblance of authority in the law or not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have expressed the opinion that they would have no protection.

Mr. REED. If the President's veto can be sustained in this instance, any bill Congress might pass, no matter how fair, how equitable, how just, would logically meet the same fate if it were vetoed by the President. So what are we to do about it? If the President's veto shall be sustained today, the power of this body to do anything on the farm question will be gone.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. Along the line of the discussion which has just taken place, as to what the effect will be, the President has made it definite in his veto message. He called attention to the fact that the Congress was advised of an interpretation—to which I shall refer in a

moment—that included the different payments. He said:

The Congress was advised of this interpretation before it passed the act of October 2, 1942.

He said at another point:

The meaning of "parity" under the original Emergency Price Control Act had been established by administrative interpretation. Furthermore, the Price Administrator's construction had been upheld by the Attorney General prior to the introduction of the act of October 2, 1942.

Then he proceeds to say that there had been an administrative interpretation, which the Attorney General had sustained, and that we knew that when we passed the act of October 2, 1942; and, as the Senator has just stated, we wrote definitely into the act a restatement of our position entirely at variance with that statement. But the President in his veto message has again called attention to the fact that administrative interpretation is to be the guiding star in the administration of the law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In other words, this is the answer made by Congress to the very suggestion along that line.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am free to say that I never knew of any administrative act fixing parity different from that provided by law, but if anyone else has heard of it, we made it absolutely clear and certain that any act of that sort hereafter would be in conflict with the law.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I not right in my understanding that the purpose of the Bankhead bill, which we are now considering, is to prevent the Office of Price Administration from placing ceilings on farm products below the level which was intended by the Congress when it enacted the Price Control Act of October 2?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. If today a majority of the Senate shall vote to override the veto by the President of the Bankhead bill, will not that action reiterate the determination of Congress or the intent of Congress that no ceiling should be placed below the parity price level?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think that is a fair interpretation, but the difficulty about the matter is that we have no way of enforcing the determination if we merely have a majority vote.

Mr. AIKEN. But the intent of a majority of Congress will be made clear by a majority vote here today, whether or not we secure the two-thirds vote to override the veto.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator is correct. Now I wish to call the attention of Senators, if they have time to read it, to the latter part of section 3, where the subject of parity prices, not income, is referred to 12 or 13 times, always using the words "parity price."

Now, I wish to bring the discussion to a close for the present. The President issued two Executive orders. One fixed a limitation on salaries of \$25,000. I did

not object to salaries being limited to any size, but from going through the debates, and the hearings, and the discussions here and in the conference committee, I knew, as well as I could know anything, that Congress did not intend by the act to delegate to the President the power which was sought to be exercised. I think that was practically the unanimous view of this body, as well as the view of the House of Representatives.

A bill was brought forward to remedy the situation, to displace the Executive order, and to insure that whatever action was taken would be taken by Congress; and it was taken by Congress, almost without objection, on the ground that the act did not vest in the President the power which he had tried to exercise.

There were many persons with large salaries—industrialists, bankers, and others—who bitterly protested against the limitation imposed by the President's order. There were some who did not draw salaries at all who protested against it, because they felt that it was an abandonment of the American form of government, the taking of power by the Executive which was not intended to be vested in the Executive.

What was done? Almost unanimously this body eliminated the Executive order, and proceeded to do the job in its own way, under the constitutional provisions which govern us all. No one here objected. We agreed that the power was not in the Executive. After we agreed that such action was not authorized, we did not insist that it be taken because of the good contained in the move for the limitation of salaries.

Are we to treat the farmers in a different way? I challenge any lawyer to point out, in the debates or anywhere else, anything to indicate authority conferred by the act on the President of the United States, or on the O. P. A. Administrator, to fix a parity price, or a ceiling price, which is related to and rests upon the parity price.

Then why, because some say the proposal is inflationary, should we temporarily abandon, as a matter of expediency, one of the old, orderly constitutional processes? Why should Congress permit the taking of power which was desired by the President but which was not given in the act? I believe that most fair-minded men, regardless of their position on this subject, will agree that the act not only did not grant the power but specifically prohibited anyone from making an order such as that issued by the President in the case we are discussing.

In the first place, it is not fair to corn producers. About 60 percent of the corn crop is produced in the commercial corn area. The producers of such corn are the only ones who receive benefit payments. The corn producers outside the commercial area do not receive such payments. If a farmer who is located in the commercial area does not comply with the program, if he is a non-cooperator, or a nonconformer, or an individualist, or whatever one may call him, he does not benefit. I think they

all should comply, but about 25 percent in the commercial corn area, I understand, do not comply, and that is their constitutional right; but the farmers who do not comply receive no benefit payments.

Mr. President, simply because producers in the commercial area have received benefit payments, a ceiling price on corn is fixed. But that ceiling price operates all over the United States, and bears down the ceiling price for all corn producers outside the commercial area, and all inside who do not comply with the program. That is not fair. That is not equal justice. That is the rankest sort of discrimination. But still the President's order takes away from parity the amount received in the commercial belt and applies that rule to corn producers everywhere. That shows the difficulty of legislating by Executive decree or proclamation. Perhaps some man fixes the order who is not familiar with the corn situation. In Congress an injustice of that sort probably would not be permitted.

Mr. President, if the veto shall be sustained, that rule will exist and may be applied to any crop in America. Nearly every farm commodity is now above parity, except wheat and corn. Other commodities have not stopped at parity. Ceilings have not been put on them. I do not know whether ceilings ought to have been put on them or not. I am not discussing the merits of that question; but they have not been, and since the passage of the Price Control Act some of the commodities have gone from below parity to as high as 148 per cent of parity.

In the case of corn producers, as I have said, the noncompliers and the ones outside the commercial area, not only will their products not be allowed to go above parity, as the products of all the other agricultural producers are permitted to go, but their products will be pulled down below parity, while their neighbors across the road are producing something else which is far above parity. If anyone desires the list of commodities read, and their position with respect to parity shown, I have the list before me. The statement with respect to agricultural prices is issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics under date of March 30, 1943. With respect to all other farm commodities than wheat and corn the percentage of price compared with parity ranges upward to as high as 148 per cent. Certainly the corn producers, and later the wheat producers, are going to be held down, and it will affect their loan rate. The loan rate is based upon the parity tied to it. When the payments in question are deducted the floor under these commodities is lowered. That is rank injustice as between farmers. It does not represent equality between them. The commodities produced by some farmers are permitted to be above parity, while others are help down below parity.

Mr. President, in conclusion I submit that we ought not to be deterred by influences which are operating in this matter from various directions, from downtown and high sources, from industrial-

ists who wish to whip John L. Lewis. I am not concerned with that. I have nothing to do with it. But every Senator knows that that is something which looms large in the decision here of the question dealing with the farmers. Influences are at work on that subject. The poor unorganized farmer cannot have such powerful influences on his side. He does not know that such influences are at work, but they are and, from what I hear, some of them are quite effective.

Mr. President, I submit that we cannot afford to suspend the Constitution and permit the assumption of power not granted to any agency of the Government, however high that agency may be. If we are satisfied that the act did not grant the power, then, if we are going to preserve the Constitution, our duty is, as I see it, very plain.

Mr. President, I do not like to vote against the President. I vote with him whenever I can, but whenever I cannot do so in line with my conscience, I do not, as Senators who have been in the Senate for some years know. I contend that the claim of inflation is not justified, but, whether justified or not, if we are going to suspend our constitutional processes because of pressure and because of the emergency, based on the contention that more money will have to be paid out, then we are bargaining off our constitutional heritage for a mess of pottage. Whenever we yield to pleas for action because of emergency, whether made by John L. Lewis or by anyone else, if the Constitution itself is involved, then we are walking on dangerous ground. We ought not to yield to such pleas from the standpoint of expediency, however great the emergency may be, because when once we knowingly do it, how long will it be before we submit to such pressure in some more dangerous form, merely because it seems to be in accord with some popular wind which is blowing.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] said that the President, as the basis for his veto, mentioned an administrative act which was upheld by an opinion of the Attorney General, and that that was the basis for his veto message. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama to tell us, before he sits down, if he knows anything about that particular opinion?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I do not.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask if any other Senator knows anything about the particular opinion which was mentioned by the President as the basis for his veto?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Such opinion has never been made public. I do not know whether or not it was a written opinion. In fact, we have no evidence of it except the statement contained in the message.

Mr. GILLETTE. No; there has never been any such opinion made public.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD subsequently said: Mr. President, in the course of my re-

marks a short time ago I stated that I had not heard from the National Farmers' Union or the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives since the President vetoed the bill, and that I was not in a position to state their attitude.

I have just had delivered to me a telegram signed by W. M. Thatcher, president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, and James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., April 6, 1943.

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

We have given vigorous support to the Bankhead bill which would protect certain farm commodity prices as regards ceilings to be determined by the Office of Price Administration. We disagree with the President's views and for the reasons assigned as the basis for his veto of your bill. We urge the Senate to override the President's veto.

NATIONAL FEDERATION
OF GRAIN COOPERATIVES,
W. M. THATCHER, President.
NATIONAL FARMERS' UNION,
JAMES G. PATTON, President.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, that puts all five of the farm organizations in line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

On this question the yeas and nays are required by the Constitution.

Mr. CAPPER rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I intend to vote to pass the so-called Bankhead bill, notwithstanding the veto of the President. I feel I ought not cast that vote without giving my reasons for doing so. I shall try to give those reasons as simply and straightforwardly as possible.

I cannot agree with the President that the enactment of this bill will result in a tornado of inflation. To say that fixing the ceiling price on wheat at parity, instead of at about 90 percent of parity; to say that to set the ceiling price on corn at 100 percent of parity, instead of at 92 percent of parity, to my mind is not the fact at all.

I mention corn and wheat at this time because they are the only foodstuffs involved in the veto. The President, in his veto message, confined his objections to the alleged increase in the cost of foodstuffs that would result from the enactment of this bill. Wheat and corn are the only two major foodstuffs or feeds that go into the making of foodstuffs that are involved.

Prices on all other major foodstuffs are already far above and beyond parity, ranging all the way from 120 percent of parity to 148 percent of parity, as of March 15 last.

Wheat and corn are below parity—wheat about 86 percent of parity, corn about 92 percent of parity.

For 10 long years this administration has preached up and down the breadth of the land, in campaign years, and frequently between campaign years, that the farmer is entitled to parity prices for his commodities. Specifically it has maintained long and loudly that the wheat grower is entitled to parity price; that the corn grower is entitled to parity.

But now, when it looks as if the law of supply and demand may, at some time in the future, cause the prices of wheat and corn to rise to parity, this administration insists, "No; you are not entitled even to a ceiling price, a maximum price of parity. You are only to get 85 percent of parity at the most, or 92 percent of parity at the most, and we will try to see that you get even less than that."

Mr. President, that is not simply inconsistency. That is hypocrisy. Also it is economically unsound. A time when this country is engaged in a world war, an all-out war, in which the great need is for production, is not the time to discourage production of vital foodstuffs. It is the time to encourage their production. Does this administration realize that it has contracted to help feed the armies and populations of other nations—foreign populations totaling hundreds of millions? Does not this administration realize that to do that is going to require greatly increased production of cereals as well as vegetables and poultry products and meats?

In administering the war program—I am trying to state this factually; if the facts constitute a criticism, that cannot be helped—the Government has aided and abetted in taking from the farms of this country hundreds of thousands of men. Many have been drafted into the Army. Still more have gone into industrial plants where they can get more money and have much easier hours. In administering this program, the Government has refused to provide the necessary farm machinery and equipment for increased farm production. The administration also has seen wages go up, production costs go up, taxes go up, sales of bonds go up, and prices of commodities go up. The prices of most farm products have gone up far beyond parity. But the administration sets its teeth firmly today and says, in spite of all this, the prices of wheat and corn must be held not merely down to parity but below parity.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the enactment of this bill should not raise the cost of foodstuffs any appreciable extent.

If the parity concept is correct, and I believe it is, then the wheat grower and the corn grower are entitled to parity prices, especially considering that all other major farm commodities are selling well above parity.

More than that, Mr. President, if the parity formula is even approximately correct, then under present conditions a parity price for corn or a parity price for wheat cannot and will not push up the price of hogs or cattle, or even of dairy or poultry products.

Let me state why that is so: If the parity formula is correct, then when hogs, cattle, dairy products, and poultry

are selling at parity or better, the feed for them should sell at parity without destroying a proper relationship between feed prices and the prices of livestock, poultry, and poultry products.

Now let us see what are the facts in this connection. On March 15, according to the report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, hogs were selling at 125 percent of parity, veal calves at 133 percent of parity, cattle at 147 percent of parity, lambs at 148 percent of parity, and dairy and poultry products at from 118 to 120 percent of parity.

What was the market price of wheat? It was 86 percent of parity. That of corn was 92 percent of parity, and wheat for feed was selling at between 85 and 90 percent of corn parity.

Can it be contended that putting the price of wheat for feed up to corn parity, even, and the price of corn to parity would drive up hog and cattle prices?

The plain facts are, Mr. President, that at the present time the prices of beef, hogs, sheep, lambs, and dairy and poultry products are not based on the cost of feed grains at all. They are being fixed by the law of supply and demand, except insofar as price controls are limiting the effect of rising prices resulting from large demands against short supplies.

Again I say that the enactment of the so-called Bankhead bill, affecting as it does only two grain feeds, wheat and corn, will not materially affect—probably not at all—the prices of hogs, cattle, and so forth. Both the O. P. A. brief on this point and the President's message are based on assumptions that do not square with the facts.

Now I desire to discuss briefly another angle. Judging from most of the editorials, messages, and harangues on the subject of the Bankhead bill, one would naturally suppose that it proposes an increase in parity price levels. It does nothing of the sort. All it attempts to do is to prohibit certain Government agencies from deducting conservation and other payments in ascertaining the parity prices and fixing the resultant new war parity prices lower than the lawful parity prices for those two feed grains.

It was very unfair, in my opinion, for the President to try to pass to these two commodities the blame for the inflation trend, just as it was unfair last fall to make the charge that the "greedy" farmers are responsible for the inflation. If wages had been stabilized, instead of being allowed to rise, the Bankhead bill might not have been necessary.

One more point, Mr. President, and I am through: At about the same time the Bankhead bill went to the White House, what was really a companion bill also went to the White House—the debt-limit bill which also repealed an Executive directive, one reducing salaries above \$25,000 net after Federal taxes to the \$25,000 net level. The same principle was involved in both measures: Whether the Executive could by directives repeal acts of Congress or whether he could write law by directive.

In the Anti-Price Inflation Act, the Congress had directed that price ceilings on farm commodities and on products

from farm commodities should not be fixed below levels that would give or reflect parity prices to producers.

Congress also had refused to reduce salaries to any specific level. It had provided for the stabilization of salaries and wages at certain existing levels.

The executive branch of the Government—and I do not question the motives back of its actions; they are well understood, I believe—had by directives attempted to do what Congress had either refused to do or had declared by statute should not be done.

The President vetoed the bill protecting farm legislation, and in doing so threatened that labor's wages would be raised unless his veto were sustained. I have not seen any veto of the other measure, which also repealed a directive.

Mr. President, in both instances the principle involved is perfectly plain.

If the executive branch of the Government had no right to issue the salary-reduction directive, it also had no right to issue the directive which makes parity on wheat and corn less than what Congress said by law that parity should be.

If the Congress was justified in repealing the salary-reduction directive from the Executive, it was right in repealing the directive which says that parity shall be, not what Congress said parity is, but some figure less than lawful parity.

On principle, if the President vetoed one of those measures, he should have vetoed both of them.

On principle, if Congress makes one of them law, I say it should also insist that the companion act be made law.

I shall vote to pass the bill, notwithstanding the veto of the President.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement from the heads of the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, sustaining the position I have taken.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 3, 1943.

To the Members of the Senate
and the House of Representatives:

We urge Congress to pass the Bankhead bill over the President's veto. At stake is the basic issue of whether we shall have government by law or by Executive decree. The amount of money involved is relatively small. The principle involved is fundamental.

In the Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, the Congress stipulated that ceilings on farm products should not be set below parity prices to farmers. This provision of the law has been nullified by Executive decree. In our opinion it is the duty of the Congress to see that the law is carried out. This can be accomplished by passage of the Bankhead bill over the veto. Enactment of this measure would permit the farmer to obtain parity in the market place, instead of being forced to depend upon subsidies from the Public Treasury. Farmers do not want, and never have wanted, subsidies when they could obtain parity prices.

Unfortunately the issue has been clouded by assertions that the Bankhead bill will

seriously increase the dangers of inflation. These assertions are based on misleading and distorted figures. Any increase in the cost of farm commodities which might result from passage of the measure would be so small as to have little, if any, effect on the cost of food to the consumer.

It is most unfortunate that again and again the American farmer has been attacked and accused of responsibility for inflation. It is apparent that once more agriculture is to be used as the whipping boy to further appease the wage demands of organized labor and to divert attention from the real source of inflation. This is seriously undermining the morale of the farmer and impairing his heroic efforts to produce to the utmost of his capacity. Not only farmers, but the general public, are becoming increasingly concerned over the ability of American agriculture to produce adequate food and fiber under present Government policies.

So that the public may know where the true blame for inflation lies, we submit the following facts based on Government records:

1. While American farmers constitute more than 22 percent of our population, they receive less than 10 percent of our national income.

2. In 1942 farm income had increased only \$1,000,000,000 over the peak figure of the last World War, while nonfarm income increased more than \$55,000,000,000.

3. Farm prices today are 10 percent below farm prices prevailing during the last World War. Hourly pay of industrial workers is nearly two and a half times greater than the peak hourly rates of World War No. 1.

4. Today the average nonfarm family is paying a lower percentage of its income for food than at any time during the past 30 years. Today 22 percent of the average nonfarm family income is spent for food, compared to 38 percent at the peak of World War No. 1.

There is, therefore, absolutely no justification for organized labor to use either the Bankhead bill or the cost of food as an excuse for demanding further wage increases. In view of the grave food shortage now confronting the country, we believe it is time to stop kicking the farmer around and to fix the blame for inflation where it properly belongs.

Agriculture has always urged that stability could be maintained only through a fair balance between industrial wages and agricultural prices. Had labor and the administration agreed to this, today the cost of living would be substantially lower. Feeling that passage of the Bankhead bill will still leave a disparity between agricultural prices and industrial wages, and, therefore, does not justify labor's demands for higher pay, we believe it to be the duty of labor to join with us in an honest attempt to reach the fair balance necessary, to the end that America may win the war and write an enduring peace.

Yours very sincerely,

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,

A. S. GOSS, Master.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,

EDWARD A. O'NEAL, President.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES,

CHARLES C. TEAGUE, President.

NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS' FEDERATION,

CHARLES W. HOLMAN, Secretary.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
FARMER COOPERATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1943.

Re President's veto Bankhead bill, S. 660.

To Members of Congress:

GENTLEMEN: We have just held a 3-day session of the executive committee of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, an organization with a membership of more than 2,000,000 farmers distributed in every State and almost every county. Members of the

executive committee came from all parts of the country. There does not exist a more able, representative, or patriotic group of men connected with agriculture.

They came together, not because of a profit motive, but because of their grave concern over the serious national food situation.

Each of them expressed the conviction that there was impending a crisis that promised to be calamitous in the production of the foods essential to feeding our armed forces, assisting our allies, and supplying our civilian population on even a greatly-restricted diet.

They were unanimously of the opinion that under the present policies of Government the minimum requirements of these essential foods would not be produced for the following reasons:

1. Before the establishment of price controls and the Little Steel formula, labor unions, supported by the Government and the device of cost-plus contracts, had raised the wages of common labor, in many cases, to double that of the pre-war period. Farmers, in order to get labor, have, in many cases, had to pay even higher wages than those paid in defense plants, and still cannot get the necessary labor for production and harvest.

2. One-third to as high as one-half of the agricultural laborers and farmers in many areas have been taken from agriculture into defense plants and into the armed forces. The work performed by these workers cannot, except in small measure, be done by inexperienced women and children.

3. Under priority rulings, material could not be obtained for machinery, repair parts, replacements, and other essential farm supplies.

4. Ill-considered application of ceiling prices has caused many maladjustments in production and distribution.

All of these conditions are discouraging and restricting production.

In many high-cost crops the risk is so great that farmers will not plant without assurance of a labor supply and a price that will at least return to them their out-of-pocket expense.

Since the establishment of price ceilings it has been the policy of the administration to hold down the price of food.

The Bankhead bill (S. 660) means little in the way of increased prices to farmers or increased costs to consumers. It does, we believe, carry out a part of the policy which Congress wrote into the Price Control Act and which was nullified by Executive order. There is a principle involved which we believe demands the support of this legislation by every Member of Congress. The time has come when parity prices, or prices to farmers as an end in themselves, is past. The dominant consideration in determining the level at which price ceilings are imposed should be: What will be the effect on supplies? Farm prices should be established primarily to get the right foods in the right quantities.

Ceiling or maximum prices should be used to safeguard the public from inflationary and speculative prices, but prices necessary to cover the costs of producing a supply of foods sufficient to provide reasonably adequate diets for the armed forces, our allies, and the civilian population cannot properly be called inflationary prices—they are necessary prices; necessary to cover costs, necessary to provide a reasonably adequate food supply, necessary to keep foods flowing through normal distributive channels rather than to a select few via the black market; necessary that everyone may have enough of something to eat even though it may not be just what he'd like to eat.

We urge the support of the Bankhead bill (S. 660) in overriding the President's veto as one step in the direction of the assurance of an adequate production of essential foods.

Sincerely yours,

C. C. TEAGUE,
President.

Mr. REED. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Overton
Austin	Guffey	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reed
Bankhead	Hawkes	Revercomb
Barkley	Hayden	Reynolds
Bone	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Holman	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McCarran	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Van Nuys
Danaher	McNary	Wagner
Davis	Maloney	Wallgren
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Murdoch	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we have come to what is, in my opinion, perhaps the most important question that has been before the Senate in my 4 years of service here. Two issues are involved. If the veto by the President of the Bankhead bill is sustained, then a majority of the Congress, including a majority of this body, will have lost the power to function.

The bill passed this body by a vote of 78 to 2. A conference report from a conference committee of the two Houses was agreed to without a yea-and-nay vote. Even if a majority of the Senate should reassert the former opinion of the body, but fail to do so by the necessary two-thirds, then, so far as concerns important legislation affecting the farm, labor, the war, finance, or anything else, the power of a majority of the Congress to function will be lost if that majority has a difference of opinion with the President of the United States.

That is the fundamental question. There are other important questions which I shall discuss; but, stripped to its bare bones and stated in bare fundamentals, that is the only permanent long-range issue. Some immediate issues are also involved.

Mr. President, I sat in my place in the Senate on the 7th of last September and listened to a message from the President of the United States, in which he declared a dictatorship unless Congress should take certain action within 30 days or less. If that is thought to be an overstatement, let me read very briefly from the President's message. He charged the Congress, first, with delay. I beg my colleagues to recall this, because I shall recur to it in a few minutes. He said that that delay on our part—

has now reached the point of danger to our whole economy.

Then he went on to say:

I ask the Congress to take this action by the 1st of October—

This was September 7, Mr. President.

I ask the Congress to take action by the 1st of October. Inaction on your part by that date will leave me with an inescapable responsibility to the people of this country to see to it that the war effort is no longer imperiled by threat of economic chaos.

In the event that the Congress should fail to act, and act adequately, I shall accept the responsibility, and I will act.

What was the thing about which the President was talking, which was so urgent that he had, in effect, declared a dictatorship, graciously postponing the effective date from the 7th of September to the 1st of October? Let me go back to the first sentence. He charged a lack of control over prices—farm prices in particular—because of the language which Congress had written into the first Price Control Act, passed in January 1942. He claimed that his hands were tied in controlling the prices of farm products. That was what threatened the economic welfare of the people. That is what the President meant when he said that—

That delay has now reached the point of danger to our whole economy.

What did the President propose to do about it? He had a program of his own, and he said that if he were given the power his purpose would be to hold farm prices at parity, or at levels of a recent date, whichever were higher.

That joined the issue. There was a situation about which the President complained and for which he charged Congress with responsibility. He wanted power to carry forward his own program. He stated what that program would be. Manifestly, if the condition existing was so grave as to threaten the welfare of the country, then certainly the President's program would make a tremendous change in the conditions which then existed and had been existing. Was that the fact? No.

Mr. President, I am bringing up this old question because, on this floor, I charged the President with needlessly alarming the people of this country. Not since Orson Welles excited many persons about a supposed invasion from Mars had any responsible voice in this country so needlessly alarmed the people as did the President in his message.

Senators may recall that at that time I had printed in the Record studies made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, one of the most responsible statistical agencies known anywhere. As briefly as I can I wish to advert to them. I called attention to the fact that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics calculated that the sum total of the price established under the policy of Congress which would be received by the farmer for the commodities about which the President complained, and the price which would be received by the farmer for the same commodities in the same quantity under the policy of the President's program, differed by only one-tenth of 1 percent. On a \$14,000,000,000 base the difference between the price received by the farmer

under the program in existence, and that which would have been received under the President's program for the same commodities was \$15,000,000, or one-tenth of 1 percent. Certainly a difference of one-tenth of 1 percent did not justify the note of alarm sounded by the President in his message to the Congress and people of this country.

Mr. President, the President of the United States has done the same thing again. That is why I have referred, in the detail which I have, to our experience of last year.

The President again agitates, alarms, misleads—one almost would be tempted to say deceives—the people of the country as to the present situation so far as his power, and so far as farm prices, and the effect of the Bankhead bill on farm prices is concerned.

I wish to read from the President's last message. I read from page 4 of the mimeographed copy:

It is difficult to forecast the actual price increase which would result under the Bankhead bill, and the estimates I have received differ widely. They all agree, however, that they will be substantial, although there is some difference of opinion as to the time when they will occur.

The President, however, in the next paragraph—and this is the statement I particularly challenge—says this:

The Bankhead bill would certainly deprive the Government of power to prevent these price increases which might—

This is the point—

which might—add more than a billion dollars to the consumers' food budget.

Mr. President, so far as any effect of the Bankhead bill on food prices is concerned, that is arrant nonsense, not to call it by a stronger term. The President of the United States owes a duty to the people greater than that shown in statements of that nature.

I now desire to proceed to a demonstration of the facts which are in direct conflict with the President's statements. I have asked the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to furnish me with basic figures dealing with the situation pertaining to the cost of food and food prices. I ask that a copy of the statement be distributed so that Senators, who are patient enough to listen, may have the figures in front of them.

On the sheet to which I have referred is a list of all the important staple food products which go to make up almost the entire food bill of the people of the United States. The table was prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The figures are not mine. They are official figures given out by the most authoritative official source, the most careful and conscientious official source in the country.

Please refer to the table at the bottom of the sheet. Let me first make a preliminary statement. Many persons attach more weight to the term "parity" or the term "parity price" than they should. As a matter of fact, a parity price is only a statement of the price a farmer should receive, and nothing in the law, in and of itself, or in the Bankhead bill or anything else, does any-

thing by way of helping the farmer to obtain that price in the market place. As a matter of fact, Congress supports certain prices by loans upon wheat, cotton, and corn. But they are always far below the parity price. No loan of which I have any knowledge is fixed at more than 90 percent, and in most cases 85 percent of the parity price.

I ask Senators to observe the items appearing in the table. For example, lambs are selling at 148 percent of the parity price. The parity price of beef cattle is \$8.73 per hundred pounds. The farm price which is actually received is \$12.80. That is 147 percent of the parity price. Suppose, for illustration, the parity price were moved up several points or down several points. It would have no effect on the price actually received and paid. The price of beef cattle and of meat in this country today is based on the law of supply and demand. During the past year, mostly within the past 6 or 7 months, we have gone away almost entirely, though not quite, from any legislative influence. All the commodities listed are selling and being bought on the basis of a price fixed by the relation of demand to the available supply, and yet the President of the United States, and Mr. Prentiss M. Brown, and the "snake doctors" in the Office of Price Administration, who manufacture statistics to prove some particular point, have in a statement put out this kind of "guff" to the country. They unfairly, unnecessarily, and needlessly alarm the people of this country. I say, without any hesitation or fear of being successfully contradicted, that the effect of passage of the Bankhead bill upon the price structure of food to the consumers of the country would be negligible. It would have some effect in about three instances to which I shall return.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have the table and accompanying statement inserted in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table and statement are as follows:

The table below, prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture, shows actual average prices received by farmers in the United States for food products as of March 15, 1943. The items listed include every important item of staple food consumption, except wheat and corn. These are given separate treatment. Vegetables, except potatoes and sweetpotatoes, and fruits, except apples, are not included because the influence of the Bankhead bill, if any, would be negligible in the whole food-price equation.

The parity price is shown in column 2. The actual average farm price is shown in column 3. The percentage relation of the actual price to the parity price is shown in column 4. Each and every price is now from 8 to 43 percent higher than the parity price. Each of these commodities is selling at a price which reflects the law of supply and demand. The actual price is not controlled by the parity price.

Price Administrator Brown, in his letter to Senator BARKLEY, and read to the Senate on March 25, intimated that the Bankhead bill would increase food prices perhaps as much

as 7 percent or \$1,500,000,000. In the President's message of April 2, it was suggested that the Bankhead bill would increase food prices more than 5 percent, or more than \$1,000,000,000. There is no basis in fact for these statements.

The effect of sustaining the Presidential veto of the Bankhead bill would be to establish a wartime parity which would be several points lower than parity as now calculated. The Administration will subtract from the present lawful parity price the amount of parity and soil-conservation payments. The Administration is doing this now. Sustaining the veto would legalize this practice.

Food prices may and probably will go somewhat higher, but that will be because of the demand as measured against the supply and not by any influence direct or indirect of the Bankhead bill.

The Bankhead bill can have no possible effect upon the current price of these commodities. The most it could do would be that the higher parity, maintained by virtue of the Bankhead bill requirements, would establish a floor if food prices should decline sufficiently to reach such a floor. This is not in the least likely.

Prices received by farmers for food products and percentage of parity or comparable price, United States, Mar. 15, 1943

Commodity	Parity or comparable price, Mar. 15, 1943	Farm price, Mar. 15, 1943	Percentage actual price is of parity price
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Dollars	Dollars	Percent
Lambs, per 100 pounds.....	9.47	13.98	148
Beef cattle, per 100 pounds.....	8.73	12.80	147
Rice, per bushel.....	1.309	1.802	138
Veal calves, per 100 pounds.....	10.87	14.45	133
Chickens, per pound.....	.184	.235	128
Cottonseed, per ton.....	36.31	45.73	126
Potatoes, per bushel.....	1.161	1.451	125
Hogs, per 100 pounds.....	11.70	14.67	125
Turkeys, per pound.....	.232	.287	121
Milk, wholesale, per 100 pounds.....	2.54	3.04	120
Eggs, per dozen.....	.284	.340	120
Apples, per bushel.....	1.55	1.85	119
Butterfat, per pound.....	.429	.505	118
Sweet potatoes, per bushel.....	1.414	1.536	109
Butter, per pound.....		.444	108

¹ Preliminary.

² Parity prices adjusted for seasonal variations.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Division of Statistical and Historical Research.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the table deals with every food crop, every food product of great importance except wheat and corn and perhaps sugar—and to that point I shall return.

I come from the great wheat-producing State, and I have read with alarm and disapproval and a bit of despair what the President said in his message about bread. Let me say that bread is the lowest priced food product anyone can buy. Relatively and actually, based upon food values, based upon the price of wheat, bread is now and has been at a subnormal level.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I desire to ascertain if I understand the Senator's argument. As I understand, his contention is that, regardless of whether or not the Congress should override the President's veto

of this bill, the price could still be regulated by the O. P. A., and that, after all, it would depend largely upon supply and demand rather than upon this particular legislation.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Montana is correct. We thought we had the matter nailed down in the recent Price Control Act so that there could not be fixed a ceiling below parity or below the highest price paid between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942. The Senator will remember that, for he, as well as I, participated actively in working out a further limitation upon the price ceilings. I say to the Senator that I have left not a particle of confidence in the administrative integrity of officials downtown. What they will do, God only knows; I do not. If their past performance is any indication of their future action, once we lose our control here in the Congress of the United States I do not know what they will do.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. I merely wish to call attention to the fact that in the letter which the head of the O. P. A., Mr. Brown, sent to Senator BARKLEY on March 24 he made this statement:

Not only have prices the farmers receive risen four times as much as the prices the farmers pay, but they have also risen four times as much as farmers' cost of production.

I call attention to the fact that I asked a representative of the Department of Agriculture this morning, who appeared before the committee after he had been threatened with a subpoena, whether or not that statement was correct. He hesitated about it, and I said, "Certainly it is not true so far as the wheat farmers are concerned, is it? The price of wheat has not risen four times." He finally acknowledged that he thought that was true.

I do not know who prepared the statement which was sent here; probably it was prepared by some official of the O. P. A., by some of the so-called economists in that organization, but it is absolutely misleading and cannot be sustained by the facts. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. REED. I disagree with the statement of Mr. Brown.

Mr. WHEELER. That is what I mean.

Mr. REED. I agree with anyone who says that what the Senator has quoted is not true.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the Price Administrator was talking about was the average increase in costs and prices.

Mr. WHEELER. But that is not what the letter says.

Mr. BARKLEY. He was talking about the average costs of production and of farm prices. Of course, one could pick a single item out of a hundred and say

that the statement did not apply to that particular article, but what Mr. Brown was talking about was the total picture of farm prices with the farmer's costs, and not simply as to one crop.

Mr. WHEELER. If that theory is correct, then one could pick out some few items which are inordinately high and say that prices of the great majority of farmers were four times higher than their costs. Of course, that would be absolutely unfair to a great majority of the farmers of the country. The statement does not say the average; it says the prices to the farmers have "risen four times as much." I say that the statement is misleading and is not in accord with the facts.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Montana knows as well as I do, and as well as does the Senator from Kentucky, that anyone who makes the statement that the average price the farmer receives on all his products has increased four times—400 percent—is not stating the fact.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the Price Administrator was doing was drawing a comparison between the increased price of farm products and the increased cost to the farmer who produces the products. It would be manifestly unfair to pick out some one crop and say that because it does not apply to that crop the whole statement is false.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Kentucky knows as well as does the Senator from Montana and I do, that, taking the average, farm prices have not increased four times.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is not what we are talking about. We are talking about comparative increase of farm prices relative to the cost of producing.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me read the statement; let us see what Administrator Brown said.

Not only have prices farmers receive risen four times as much as the prices farmers pay—

I submit that that statement alone is not correct, whether we take the average or take some particular farm crop.

Mr. REED. I agree with the Senator from Montana as to that.

Mr. WHEELER. Secondly, Administrator Brown says:

but they have also risen four times as much as farmers' cost of production.

The Bureau of Statistics of the Agricultural Department this morning said they did not have the statistics and could not figure out what the cost of production is. So I say those two statements are misleading. I do not attribute that to former Senator Brown; I know he was taking the word of some of his statisticians in the organization who know about as much concerning farming and farm prices and agricultural products as a young man who is just out of Columbia or Harvard University.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Montana and the Senator from Kentucky

and I, know that Prentiss Brown, our former colleague, is a fair, square, straightforward, honorable gentleman, but he was made a sucker of last year by O. P. A., and there is a fair basis for the assumption that he is to be made a sucker of by the O. P. A. now.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not think it is fair to former Senator Brown for the Senator from Kansas to rise here and say that he was made a sucker out of by somebody.

Mr. REED. If Dave Ginsburg did not make a sucker out of Mr. Brown, I do not know what the significance of the expression is.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whatever may be said of Mr. Ginsburg, I think it would take a far better man than he to make a sucker out of Mr. Brown.

Mr. REED. Ginsburg is a pretty smart man.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course it is true, as I presume even the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Montana, along with the Senator from Kentucky and all other Senators, must admit, that we have to have people help us obtain the facts we present here.

We ourselves do not have the time to dig them all out. Frequently I obtain figures which I have requested from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Treasury Department, and all other departments, but if someone wishes to condemn the figures I present, or figure presented by the Senator from Kansas, all he has to do is to rise on the floor of the Senate and say, "The Senator himself did not ascertain those facts; he asked some little statistician or some little bureaucrat in Washington to get them for him." We create a bureau and someone appoints a man to be the head of the bureau, and we immediately criticize him as a bureaucrat.

Mr. REED. If the Senator will pardon my relating something that occurred at a lunch table discussion, a Senator stated that when the supplemental appropriation bill came before us he intended to move to strike out provision for all economists in general, and the economists of the Office of Price Administration in particular.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure that would not affect anyone in the Senate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to proceed for a moment with the discussion of wheat, because it has been asserted that a great injustice was going to be done to the consumers of bread. I wish to go back and repeat what I have already said, that of all the articles of food, bread is the lowest in price. The price is subnormal. It has been subnormal for a long time. There was a group of Members of this body who actively fought with the O. P. A. last winter to keep the O. P. A. and the Secretary of Agriculture from going into an extensive campaign to keep the price of wheat down.

I do not know where the President gets the figure of a cent or a cent and a half a loaf. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that I shall again refer to the

Bureau of Agricultural Economics. They furnished me this time, as they always do, with a great many figures. I depend on them, it is true.

Mr. President, I wish now to distribute to Senators a statement to which I shall call attention. I distribute copies of this statement because it contains an opinion of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics which controverts the O. P. A. I should like to have the statement distributed because it goes to the heart of the wheat, flour, and bread question.

Mr. President, there is no reasonable ground for belief that the Bankhead bill will have any effect on the market price of wheat for the remainder of the present marketing year, which ends June 30, 1943. The parity price of wheat on the farm as of March 15, 1943, was \$1.423. The actual average price received by farmers on March 15, 1943, was \$1.227, which is 19 cents below the parity price. The price received was 86 percent of the parity price, but the parity price is not the controlling factor in the grain market at the present time. The actual marketing situation is:

Wheat has been below parity over a long period of years. In wheat, parity is merely an expression of what the farmer ought to receive. Giving the wheat farmer a parity price in the market place is a pious hope yet to be fulfilled. The loan value of wheat is the dominant influence.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. So far as wheat is concerned, regardless of whether or not the veto shall be sustained, the bill would not have anything to do with bringing the price of wheat up to parity.

Mr. REED. It would not have the remotest influence. The Bankhead bill, enacted or rejected, would not have the remotest immediate effect, and only a very negligible effect in the future, on the price of wheat.

Mr. WHEELER. As a matter of fact, the price of wheat has very little to do with the cost of bread at any time.

Mr. REED. It is an important but not the controlling factor.

Mr. WHEELER. It has very little to do with it. It has something to do with it, but very little to do with the price of bread anywhere in the United States.

Mr. REED. In a moment I shall come to an authoritative expression of opinion upon the bread question, and the extent to which bread might be affected by the price of wheat. I now return to my statement.

The loan value of wheat for the 1942 crop was announced by the Secretary of Agriculture on May 1, 1942, before the marketing of the new crop began. It is 85 percent of the average farm parity of wheat during the preceding year.

The 1942 wheat crop loan value is 85 percent of a parity price of \$1.34, or \$1.14 on the farm. Let us now move from the farm to the market place.

The great winter wheat market is Kansas City. To the farm-loan price of

\$1.14 on the farm, 13 cents is added to cover freight charges and country elevator costs. The loan value of wheat at Kansas City is \$1.27 per bushel. Cost of storage, insurance, handling, and other charges may amount to as much as 13 cents per bushel. Wheat, in the market at Kansas City, has a base value of \$1.27. When sold in the market, whatever portion of the total carrying charge—13 cents—has accrued, must be added to the price unless the seller takes a shrink in his price. He does not usually do this. If wheat is stored under loan on the farm, the farmer storing it may receive 7 cents a bushel for the storage. Storage costs are added to the loan price. The farmer storing his own wheat receives this addition to his price.

Wheat is selling at Kansas City at between \$1.35 and \$1.39—mostly at \$1.37 or \$1.38.

The big factor is:

When the market price at Kansas City goes above \$1.27, which is the loan value, plus an amount sufficient to meet the accrued carrying charges, which at this season may average 10 cents a bushel, loan wheat comes freely into the market from the farm where it has been stored. This is what holds the price range around \$1.37. That price covers the loan and the carrying charges. If the farmer has stored his own wheat, he gets the benefit.

Mr. President, I wish to add at this point that the parity price of wheat in Kansas City at this time is \$1.55, and wheat is being bought and sold on the market every day at \$1.37. In the name of Heaven, how could the Bankhead bill affect that? It simply could not do it. Whoever makes the claim that it would, makes a mistake. Whoever holds out to the people of this country the idea that their food costs may be determined by such "bosh" as that, is guilty of action which brings on disunity.

Mr. BUTLER, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. REED. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in order to emphasize the point which the Senator from Kansas is making, I should like to ask a question or two. If I am correct there are approximately 600,000,000 bushels of wheat available under Government loans.

Mr. REED. I could not give the figure as of this date. The last time I had occasion to inquire it was in the neighborhood of 600,000,000 bushels; that is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. That is approximately the amount today. Under the market conditions which have prevailed until the consideration of this bill became rather warm, it was possible for the owner of wheat who had a Government loan on it to dispose of the wheat and have a little margin left over and above the original loan. In other words, there was a continual flow of wheat into the market channels from the owner, the farmer, in

the country. But the market the last few days has declined a total of about 6 or 8 cents a bushel. A farmer who has a loan on his wheat cannot sell the wheat and cash in. Therefore as a matter of necessity, with the wheat loans all falling due on April 30, the last of this month, the wheat which is under loan will all come into the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Will there be any opportunity for a further advance in the market when the Government, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, owns all the available wheat?

Mr. REED. I have not followed the market as closely as has the Senator from Nebraska, but the fact of the matter remains, assuming the information given by the Senator from Nebraska to be correct, that this agitation, the deep fears which have been created in the country, are penalizing the farmers whose crop is already below, and has been for 25 years below the point we call parity. If there has ever been a greater injustice done to any class of people in this country than is being done to the farmers now in general, and to the wheat farmers in particular, then I am not conscious of it.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. There is no way by which wheat can be brought up to parity under the Bankhead bill.

Mr. REED. Absolutely not.

Mr. WHEELER. It can be brought up to parity if the Government makes a loan practically at the full parity price, or if the surplus wheat now on hand should be taken off the market by being consumed.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. WHEELER. Wheat is not going to parity until that occurs. It seems to me perfectly ridiculous for anyone to make a statement that the price of wheat is going to go up as the result of the passage of the Bankhead bill. I am not speaking for the farmers of other sections of the country, but in Montana the majority of the farmers, aside from the stockmen and cattlemen, are wheat raisers, and I resent statements being given out by the O. P. A. and by others intimating that the farmers of my State are the cause of inflation. Such a statement is perfectly ridiculous. The truth about the matter is that the wheat farmers of my State have not complained and are not complaining particularly about the price of wheat at the present time. They realize the situation. They realize that it is going to be difficult for them to get any higher price for wheat than they are receiving at the present time no matter what is done by Congress. What is causing the farmer in my State more trouble than anything else is the wage the laboring man is receiving in some war industries. I am not complaining about that, but I call attention to an advertisement appearing in the Miles City, Mont., daily newspaper, as follows:

**MEN WANTED FOR VITAL WAR INDUSTRY
CARPENTERS, HELPERS, LABORERS**

Immediate employment. Excellent working conditions. Help win this war—build cargo barges for use against the enemy.

This is a real war job where your help is urgently needed. Act immediately.

Top wages—9 hours per day—6 days per week. Time and one-half after 40 hours.

An inexperienced man can earn \$250 per month.

Lodging accommodations available.

J. C. BOESFLOG CONSTRUCTION CO.,
Marine Division, Anacortes, Wash.

Will someone tell me how we can keep the farmer on the farm when, whether he is experienced or inexperienced, he can go into war industry and earn as much as \$250 a month? The advertisement says that an inexperienced man can earn \$250 per month. There is only one way the farmer is going to be able to compete with such a condition as that, or keep help on the farm, and that is to be given a reasonable price so he can afford to pay more wages. That is as simple as that 2 and 2 make 4. The statisticians can argue all they want to, but they cannot get away from the plain facts in the case.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Montana knows that we have discussed the farm labor question on the floor of the Senate for almost a year past. I agree with the inference which I think the Senator from Montana intends to leave, that at no time have we ever gotten into the heads of the administrators downtown, the "bureaucrats," if the Senator from Kentucky does not object to the term, any consciousness of the trouble, of the actual situation, of the danger which threatens the country in respect to a food shortage.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator from Kansas, that as he states the facts, the bill will not increase the price of wheat to the farmer. But if it will not increase the price of wheat to the farmer what is the use of voting for it?

Mr. REED. The Senator from Ohio has given me an opening to deal immediately with a question which I intended to discuss later.

Mr. TAFT. I think now is the time to deal with it, because there is before the Senate a bill which undoubtedly will give the country the impression of general inflation.

Mr. REED. Why? Because of—

Mr. TAFT. I do not care why. I am saying that is the fact. I want to know what is the use of passing it if it will not raise the price to the farmer?

Mr. REED. Because there is a principle involved which is much bigger than the mere question of the price of any farm commodity at this time, and if the Senator from Ohio—

Mr. TAFT. What is the principle? Frankly, I do not quite see what the principle is.

Mr. REED. I intend to come to that later, if the Senator will be patient until I reach that point.

Mr. TAFT. We have deducted these payments on farm loans and in other cases, but, while I do not think they ought to be deducted, I do not regard that as any great question of principle.

Mr. REED. I have not said that. If the Senator from Ohio will have patience

and listen, I will come to the question of principle. I think it will interest even the Senator from Ohio. I wish to discuss that particular question.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly there is a question of principle involved it seems to me, in whether the President or the executive departments have the right—

Mr. REED. And the power.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; whether they have the right and the power under the law to deduct. I contend they do not have any right under the law to deduct. They do not have any business to deduct. There are certain kinds of wheat of which we do not have a surplus, but in my judgment the passage of the bill would not affect to any appreciable extent the price of the wheat of which we do have a surplus. I doubt if it will affect it at all. But in my judgment there is a matter of principle involved, as to whether under the law the President has the right or does not have the right to deduct these payments.

Mr. TAFT. When we passed the anti-inflation bill in October my impression was that the payments in question were not to be deducted, but I must say I think the act is ambiguous, and I have studied it with great care. I think an argument can be made that they can be deducted. Certainly under the conference report they can be deducted. That may have been wrong. I did not know that such language was in the report. I do not think I would have agreed to it had I known that it contained such language; but it does contain it.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Ohio was a member of the conference committee.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. REED. And the Senator did not know anything about it?

Mr. TAFT. I do not remember the subject being discussed.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. That is in the conference committee. But unfortunately the wording of the bill is ambiguous. The conference report is ambiguous. I am not saying that the President is correct. I only say that I do not see any great question of principle involved in the interpretation of the Price Control Act.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, while the Senator from Ohio is on that point, let me say that the President put his interpretation on the bill in his Executive Order No. 9250, as I recall, issued on October 2 of last year. The Bankhead bill, as we passed it, was nothing more than a reiteration of the Senate's position. There was nothing new in that. In October of last year, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 308 declaring the Senate's position on the question of deductions of these payments from parity prices. Later it was written into the Bankhead bill, which was introduced in the present session, and which the Senate passed.

The point is that we passed the Bankhead bill by a vote of 78 to 2. In doing

so, we stated and reiterated what I thought was a proper construction of the law. The Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Ohio voted for the bill. The bill went to the House, was slightly amended, came back to the Senate, was further considered by the Senate, and was sent to conference; and the conference report was agreed to by the Senate by unanimous vote. In the bill the President is told what in our opinion is the proper construction of the law. Either we did not know what we were doing when we passed the bill in the Senate by a vote of 78 to 2, and we did not know what we were doing when on the conference report we reaffirmed our action by unanimous vote, or now, if we accept the veto of the President, we are stultifying ourselves.

If we do that, a majority of this body and a majority of the House have absolutely lost all control over legislation. That would mean that unless the President of the United States in exercising his undoubted constitutional privilege and duty of veto agreed with the majority in both Houses, a majority would be powerless.

We passed the law. There was not very much difference of opinion about it. It is true that there was a great deal of confusion and discussion relative to it. The Senator from Ohio referred to that. I have never questioned the good faith or integrity of Prentiss Brown. I do not do so now. I do say that in the closing days of the consideration of the price-control bill there was around him a bunch of people who would mislead anyone. I ran into them in the lounge—a group including Mr. Ginsburg. They talked to me about their conception of the bill and their understanding of it. I told them that their construction and their understanding was not mine. But they caused the then Senator Brown to put into the *Record* a statement which never was read on the floor. It was a piece of bad faith for which I never charged Mr. Brown with any responsibility, and I do not do so now. I simply say they made a sucker out of him. I said that a while ago. I think that is the case, and is about the shortest way to explain this matter.

Now I desire to talk about the price of wheat. I am sure the Senator from Montana will be interested. First, I read a paragraph from a memorandum on wheat prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture. The Senate has heard the discussion, has heard the President's message, and has heard what Mr. Brown said about the possibility of the price of bread going up. Let us see what the most authoritative source in the country said:

Since the outbreak of the war the price of wheat has advanced materially, but this has been from a very low level. The price of wheat and the income to farmers from wheat are still considerably below levels reached in the previous war period. At the outbreak of war in Europe in August 1939, the farm price of wheat averaged only about

55 cents per bushel. This was only 49 percent of parity and the price has remained below parity, now in March being up only to 86 percent. The cash income from wheat in 1942—

The cash income for farmers from all the wheat marketed in the United States in 1942, a period of prosperity for the farmer—and there can be no doubt it was a prosperous period, and, relatively speaking, the farmer of today is better off, but even now he is receiving only 53 percent as much cash income as that which the wheat farmers received during the First World War period.

Mr. President, bread, the finished product of wheat, is the cheapest thing in the entire range of foods. It was selling below a fair price at the time when ceilings were set, and is still selling below a fair price. The price of bread could be increased, as a matter of fact, about 2 cents a loaf without throwing it out of line with comparable food costs at this time. Neither Administrator Brown nor the President claim that an increase of more than one-half cent to a full cent would be brought about by any action of the Bankhead bill. This is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel when viewing the food situation as a whole.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics, of the Department of Agriculture, has advised me that on the average an advance of about 50 cents a bushel in the price of wheat would be necessary in order to justify an addition of approximately 1 cent to the price of a 1-pound loaf of bread. An increase of one-half a cent in the average price of bread would be more than adequate to cover the increased cost of material in the event wheat prices rose to the present parity. They are not likely to advance even that far.

Now I shall refer to a subject which I think will interest the Acting President pro tempore, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who is the present occupant of the chair. That subject is corn. Both the President and Mr. Brown, and the economists, mention three products. They mention corn and sugar and one other product. What is the corn situation? The parity price on corn now would be approximately \$1.06 a bushel. They hold out and express the fear that if the price of corn were allowed to go up a little, feed costs would be affected so greatly that the price of meat would be increased. Their view finds no support from any reliable, authoritative source. As a matter of fact, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has told me definitely that, in its opinion, the price of corn could go up from the present ceiling of about \$1.01 or \$1.01½ for No. 3 yellow corn in Chicago to the full parity price, which, as I remember, is about \$1.06, without having any effect upon the price of meat, whether meat from beef, lambs, pork, chickens, or what-not, the consumer buys.

They also refer to sugar. I have always deferred to the Senator from

Michigan—I am sorry he is not present at this moment—the Senator from Nebraska, the Senators from Colorado, and the Senators from Utah on the beet-sugar question. I shall leave that question largely to them; but I desire to make one statement regarding it: As I remember, the President and Mr. Brown held out the idea that there may be an added cost to the consumer of \$200,000,000 a year in the price of beet sugar.

Mr. President, there is already under way a program by the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture to handle an increase in beet-sugar production. That program may be made successful, granting higher prices to beet-sugar producers, at a cost, not of \$200,000,000, but \$25,000,000. I have that statement before me in writing from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The Bureau did not make the statement because it shared my view. I do not ask the Bureau to endorse what I say. The Bureau told me the truth. That is the difference between honest economists and statisticians and what I have referred to as the "snake doctors" in the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] was absent when I laid the sugar question in his lap.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment before he leaves the sugar question? It has given me more trouble than any other.

Mr. REED. The authorities on sugar are the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. TAFT. The difficulty is that with respect to sugar the benefit payment, which is not to be deducted, is already paid by the consumer through a tax. It differs entirely from the corn and wheat situation.

Mr. REED. That is true.

Mr. TAFT. There seems to me to be much more justification for deducting the payments made in the case of sugar than there is in the case of wheat and corn, but the bill lumps them all together, so that we cannot deal separately with each commodity.

Mr. REED. If I had been drafting the bill I should have exempted sugar, or changed the Sugar Control Act. The Senator from Alabama did not do so.

Let me read to the Senator from Ohio a confirmation of the statement I made a moment ago, that this problem can be handled at a cost of \$25,000,000, instead of \$200,000,000, and without raising the price to the consumer.

Mr. TAFT. I do not see how that can be done.

Mr. REED. Let me read a letter written to me by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in response to my request for information on the sugar question. It is a long letter, but this is the salient point:

The Secretary of Agriculture has already announced plans for the Commodity Credit Corporation to subsidize processors of the 1943 beet crop \$1.50 per ton of beets.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Let me conclude this brief paragraph. The memorandum can be found in the Federal Register for March 18, 1943, at page 3331. Continuing—

If this subsidy rate were raised to about \$2.38 per ton, the difference between the estimated 1942 farm price of sugar beets and the estimated 1943 parity price, the price ceilings on sugar could be maintained at their present levels and farmers would receive a return equal to the parity price plus the Government payments, or about \$11.50 per ton. This subsidy would cost the Commodity Credit Corporation about \$25,000,000. A comparable subsidy to continental cane growers would amount to around \$7,000,000.

That would make a total of \$32,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. The difficulty with that proposal, as I see it, is that the Bankhead bill provides that those farmers shall not be subsidized, or, if they are, the subsidy must not be considered in computing the parity prices. So the subsidy plan which the Senator is suggesting is one which is ruled out by the Bankhead bill, which would make it impossible of accomplishment.

The Bankhead bill says, in effect, that the price must be increased. We cannot increase the price of beet sugar without increasing the price of cane sugar. It would cost the public a minimum of a cent a pound, which would mean \$120,000,000.

The Bankhead bill says that we must meet the situation by increasing the price, and we cannot afford a subsidy, because we cannot deduct the subsidy from the prices which the farmer must receive. He must get both the price and the subsidy.

Mr. REED. I am not an authority on sugar. I think I know something about wheat, and a little about corn, cattle, hogs, and such things as that, but I do not know much about sugar. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] told me that he would protect the interests of the beet sugar growers, but he has failed to do so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to answer the Senator from Ohio, and then I shall be happy to take on the Senator from Michigan.

I shall be glad to turn over to the Senator from Ohio a copy of the memorandum to which I have referred, which is rather lengthy. It is intended to handle the subsidy program through the processors. At the present time the price is based upon the sugar content of beets. As I remember, every ton of beets produces about 310 pounds of raw sugar. Not being entirely familiar with the arrangement, I may perhaps be in error. As I understand the arrangement, after the processing reaches a certain point, the processor and the farmer divide the profit. The farmer gets his price based upon the sugar content of his beets. I think it is the intention of the Secretary of Agriculture to handle this subsidy program through the processors, if that answers the question raised by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will read the Bankhead bill, he will see that it

provides that no subsidy to the processor, any more than to the original farmer, may be taken into account or deducted in fixing the parity price. So we must pay the parity price, and then add any subsidy. The suggested plan may be a very good one; but I say that it will be made impossible if we pass the Bankhead bill.

Mr. REED. I differ with the Senator from Ohio on that point. I am constitutionally opposed to a subsidy if there is any way to avoid it. One of the main differences of opinion between Mr. Leon Henderson and myself was that he had a wholesale scheme for subsidizing consumers. I believe that production can be handled on a subsidy basis to some extent. For example, copper and sugar are now being handled on that basis. All that was suggested to me was that a variation of that plan could be followed. I asked for it in connection with my discussion of the Bankhead bill.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has never yet misled me, so I feel safe in saying to the Senator from Ohio that it is the belief of the officials of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics that this problem can be handled in the way I have suggested, at a cost to the consumer not of \$200,000,000 but approximately \$30,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. I agree that we can give the beet-sugar growers an increase of \$1.90 or \$2 a ton for beets at a very much lower cost than would be involved in raising the price of sugar. However, the Bankhead bill would nullify the possibility of doing so, because under the terms of the Bankhead bill if we raise the price of beets to the producers \$2 a ton we must pass it on in the price of sugar to the consumer.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sorry I missed the Senator's discussion of this subject. I listened very faithfully to the first 20 minutes of his address, which was the extent of my original contract with him. I was called from the Chamber in connection with conferences with respect to this bill, or I should have returned sooner.

This has nothing particularly to do with the argument which the Senator has had with the Senator from Ohio, but I should like to keep the record straight. The Senator has been complaining about unreliable information. He presents a memorandum which says that the Secretary of Agriculture has already announced plans for the Commodity Credit Corporation to subsidize processors of the 1943 wheat crop \$1.50 per ton of beets. Has the Senator any information about any subsidization of processors in connection with this program?

Mr. REED. The memorandum is my authority.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I believe the Senator will find that the subsidy would go directly to the grower. The processor has been ground down to a contract under which he will be very fortunate if he can even survive. In many instances processors will have to go out of business,

and as a result the sugar-beet producer will find himself without any opportunity to have a processor. Therefore he will be harmed just as much as though he had been harmed in the first instance.

Mr. REED. I am glad the Senator from Michigan called my attention to that. This memorandum or letter is dated April 3, 1943, and reads as follows:

HON. CLYDE M. REED,

United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REED: In response to your telephone call yesterday I am enclosing a statement about the effect of the Bankhead bill on prices for sugar.

It is signed by the Agricultural Economic Statistician, who, upon request, always furnishes me with information of this nature from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. If they have made a mistake, it is the first time in all my contact with them that they have made an erroneous statement on an important subject such as this.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Unless I am totally misinformed—and I do not think I am—the statement that the new sugar program subsidizes processors of the 1943 beet crop is totally inaccurate.

Mr. REED. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that I will leave the processors to him. If I can take care of the beet-sugar farmer I think I shall be doing my duty.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Exactly; and that is the mistake which the Department of Agriculture is making. It has taken care of the beet grower; but a beet grower without an available neighborhood processor might just as well have no beets.

Mr. REED. I shall be glad to give the Senator from Michigan a complete copy of the memorandum to which I have referred.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the remainder of the memorandum is anything like what I have read, I am not much interested.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Michigan is pitting his knowledge, or lack of knowledge—whichever he chooses to call it—against a definite statement from the best and most authoritative source on matters of this kind in the whole Government. The Senator may be right. Far be it from me to say who is right. If this information is in error—and there is always the possibility of an error—it is the first serious error I have ever detected in information given me by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. President, I wish to bring my remarks to a close. I should like to return to what the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] said. If he cannot see the principles involved, it is most unfortunate for him, for the principle, and for the Senate.

Questions of price and subsidy, the cost of this or that commodity, and the matter of price ceilings are temporary. For the moment such factors may be of advantage or disadvantage. However, there is one definite, long-range, far-reaching, fundamental principle involved in the question and in the vote which we shall cast. Stating it as tersely as I can, the question is whether we shall continue to have a Government of law

under the Constitution, the principal source of power being the people, whose will is expressed through Congress in the passage of legislation by a constitutional majority of the two Houses, or whether we shall have a Government by Executive decree. Shall Congress abdicate? Are the people willing that Congress shall turn over to the President the power to issue decrees which are at variance with the plain intent of Congress?

Let us agree with the statement of the Senator from Ohio that the language of the Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, may be ambiguous. I do not agree with the statement. The intent was plain to me. I had some part in the adoption of language in an attempt to prepare a formula which would meet the objections of everyone and save the face of everyone. It was not ambiguous to me; but let us assume that the language was ambiguous.

Last October I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 308 to clear up that very point. I never pressed it for passage. The Seventy-seventh Congress was drawing to a close. The question was bound to arise during the present Congress. The bill of the Senator from Alabama is nothing more or less than a reiteration by the Congress of what we understood we were doing when we enacted the Price Control Act. That is all.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the point which I wish to make. I say that unless the Bankhead bill is passed over the President's veto, the majority of the Congress—the majority in each House—will have lost its power. The question as to what Congress meant or what ought to be done is directly in issue. We expressed our intent when we enacted the original law. By a vote of 78 to 2, we reaffirmed our statement of intent. The bill went to the House of Representatives and was there passed by an overwhelming vote. The conference report was agreed to by the Senate by a unanimous vote.

Were we playing and fooling around all that time, or were we in earnest? We were in earnest. We were saying, "This is what we intended to say, and this is what ought to be done." A vote of two-thirds of each House of Congress, not merely a majority, is required to reaffirm the intention of Congress in the first place and to make effective legislation which has been under consideration in the Congress during the past year or two.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Butler	Eastland
Austin	Byrd	Ellender
Bailey	Capper	Ferguson
Ball	Chandler	George
Bankhead	Chavez	Gerry
Barkley	Clark, Idaho	Gillette
Bone	Clark, Mo.	Green
Brewster	Connally	Guffey
Brooks	Danaher	Gurney
Burton	Davis	Hatch
Bushfield	Downey	Hawkes

Hayden	Millikin	Taft
Hill	Moore	Thomas, Idaho
Holman	Murdoch	Thomas, Okla.
Johnson, Calif.	Nye	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel	Tunnell
Kilgore	O'Mahoney	Tydings
La Follette	Overton	Vandenberg
Langer	Pepper	Van Nuys
Lodge	Radcliffe	Wagner
Lucas	Reed	Wallgren
McCarran	Revercomb	Walsh
McClellan	Reynolds	Wheeler
McFarland	Robertson	Wherry
McKellar	Russell	White
McNary	Shipstead	Wiley
Maloney	Smith	Willis
Mead	Stewart	Wilson

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, since I obtained the floor I have been informed by the senior Senator from Alabama that he intends to make a motion to refer to the committee the bill with the veto message of the President. I rise to speak in behalf of sustaining the veto of the President and also for the purpose of opposing the motion to refer.

What we are dealing with, Mr. President, is not, primarily, a matter of prices or a matter of wages. We are dealing with the necessity of stabilization. The issue before the Senate is not a farmer issue nor is it a labor issue. It is not a party issue in any sense. It is a national issue; the national interest is involved. We will either stabilize the American economy now or we will go faltering and trembling down the road to economic wreck and national disaster.

We have been undertaking for some time to reach the point of stabilization, and there has appeared to be a conflict of interest, a competition, and I might say a rivalry, as between one group, which we will call the workers represented by organized labor in their several organizations, and the other group, the farmers, represented by the farmer organizations. There are two standards. Unfortunately each of them is variable, and we have reached the point where we must put an end to the variation.

One of the standards set up is the standard of the cost of living. Labor is saying, "We can never have stability of wages; we can never arrest the tendency of wages to rise; we will not permit you to find a level by which you and the country can abide so long as under us and under our wages the cost of living constantly rises." That is a reasonable position.

On the other hand, we have the standard of parity for the farmers. Parity, as we generally understand it, is a price to the farmers which gives them the status of equality in the market in buying and selling. So long as wages rise the farmer's cost in buying rises, and he answers, "I will not be content with any parity formula; I will not be content with any sort of price arrangement you may make so long as my costs in the market are rising." That, too, is a reasonable position.

That is the situation which is presented here; that is the situation which was presented to the President of the United States. We must deal now with those two standards, and we must deal with them with a view to a lasting sta-

bilization. We must arrest the progress of each firmly and instantly.

One of the Senators said that the Bankhead bill was a small matter, that its consequences would be light. I am not disposed to debate that point. I do not know whether its consequences would be heavy or light, but I am inclined to think that, in the important matter of prices, they will be greater than we anticipate. Let us, however, consider the matter from the standpoint of the proponents of the bill and of its author. He said the consequences in the markets on the cost of living would be relatively small. Let us grant that, for the purpose of the argument; but I remind the Senate that a small breach in the barrier of stabilization at this time is just as disastrous as a great one, and the small breach predicates the great one.

We are dealing with an extremely serious situation. Stabilization is the antidote to inflation, and there is no other antidote. While a great deal has been said in the Senate in the past 7 or 8 years, more lately and ever increasing, about inflation, I question, nevertheless, whether most of us realize how serious are the implications of that word. If we ever yield to inflation, if we ever lose control of the forces which make for inflation, we are sunk. We not only lose the American economy, but we make it infinitely difficult to win the war. I do not wish to say anything that would give aid or comfort to our enemies; things are going very well for us on the battlefields; but today there is more of danger on the American battlefield than there is on the European or the Asiatic or the African. Shoot the American economy to pieces, let the chaos and the disaster of inflation come upon us, lose our last opportunity to stabilize our economy here today, and I will not venture to say at what time or under what conditions this country would recover the morale, the revenue, and the spirit necessary to win the war and win the peace.

Mr. President, we have already entered into the period and into the process of inflation. Our problem now is not to prevent inflation, but to control it, arrest it, and prevent its consequences.

Here are the evidences of inflation: First, the rapidly rising prices in all directions. We do not have to go far. There are the rapidly rising prices in the dining room downstairs, the rapidly rising prices down the street, in the stores; the loss of money values and the increase of commodity values, and the ever-increasing demand for more wages. Miners are coming forward now and saying, "Why, \$7 a day is not sufficient." "Why is it not?" "Because \$7 a day does not pay the bills for our children, for breakfast and dinner and supper."

We have also the factor of inflation in the constantly increasing public expenditures paid for by borrowed money. We probably cannot help that. We are in the war, and we must see it through at any cost; but there has never been a country which could spend money at the rate of \$75,000,000,000 a year, most of it borrowed, without running into inflation.

I was reading in the newspaper last night a simple statement that the War Department is spending money at the rate of \$4,000,000,000 a month—\$48,000,000,000 a year—in one branch. I read a statement a few days ago, which I think is true, that in this war we are spending on battleships and cargo ships alone more than we had to spend in the First World War.

I think I can add to those statements another of very great significance. The United States of America is spending in this war at the present time more than all the other nations engaged on both sides are spending. And coupled with that is the statement of Mr. Jesse Jones that the excess of national income, estimated at \$119,000,000,000, over consumable goods available for purchase this year will be between forty and fifty billion dollars and that excess will seek something to purchase.

All those things mean that we are in the very vortex of inflation. Senators say we should refer the bill, and delay it. It is not possible to delay when we come to put out a fire. We cannot hesitate when we come to deal with such factors making for inflation as these, and when the evidences of the inflation are all about us, even as the flames in a burning house. We must act firmly, we must act instantly, we must act with the utmost intelligence, not in the interest of the farmers, not in the interest of labor, not in the interest of the politicians, but in the national interest, which embraces the farmers, the workers, and the politicians and which carries at this hour the last best hope of earth.

I could mention other evidences of inflation. Look at the black market growing up all over America. That is a manifestation of the inflationary flame licking out here and there. To mention another, look at the stock market today. There is a new demand for equity stock. Once again there are large turn-overs, for men distrustful of the value and purchasing power of money are trying to find somewhere to place it.

Another evidence is the general unrest throughout the country. Our people are not discontented with what the boys are doing in the war. They are their sons, and they are proud of them. But from one end of the country to the other—and I hope I am not saying anything now that gives aid or comfort to our enemies—from one end of the country to the other there is a restlessness, there is a discontent, there is a fear, and it is based on the fact that when the housewives and the mothers and the fathers go to the market in the morning, they do not know what to expect. The prices are rising all the time, the situation is running out of their hands, and they are complaining about their Government, when, as a matter of fact, they are really complaining about the instability in the midst of which they have been cast.

I do not know of anything that would bring more happiness to the American people right now than some strong word from the Senate—which they still trust—

that from now on we are going to have stability in the United States; that we are going to save our economy, that we are going to arrest the rise in wages, that we are going to grapple with the labor leaders, who constantly stir the workers up with discontent, to demand more and more and more, and that we are going to grapple, too, with the farm leaders, with all due respect to them, well knowing that it is their business to make a new demand every day.

I am not blaming them for that, for by that means they have their living; but we should be ready to say to them that the hour has come in America when they, too, along with the workers, with Senators, with the consumers, with the soldiers and the sailors and the men in the air shall rally around the flag and demand that the economy of their country shall be stabilized, thereby to effect a saving to all persons within the country.

So, Mr. President, we must succeed with this matter of stabilization, and succeed promptly, or face consequences which I do not undertake to describe. I know that some Senators will say "this is a small matter; let it go." Another question will come before us tomorrow, and some Senators may say "this, too, is a small matter; let it go." And on and on we shall go. I say we have reached the point where we must meet the wage situation, the cost of living situation, the worker situation, and the farmer situation, and strike a firm note and say, "Here we stand for stability and we will not be moved."

Mr. President, we have a program for stabilization. The program was established by the Congress, and I feel that if any program can succeed, that program can. But I am here to say that it cannot succeed if we tamper with it or trifle with it. What is the program? We have rationing, and we cannot have stabilization now without rationing. I do not want to make a speech today about rationing. I have one word to say about it, and I say it to all the American people. The time has come for us to quit quarreling about rationing, and to take it as it is. Quit going home and complaining about rationing. It is a necessity. It is a part of the stabilization program.

The next portion of the stabilization program is the price and wage ceilings involved in the measure before us and its veto. We undertook in October of last year to establish the principle of wage and price ceilings. From the day we began until now there has been no end of kicking and quarreling and complaining. Very naturally, in a democracy perhaps the administration of the program was not perfect by a long shot, and it is not now perfect, and never will be perfect; but it is a program fixed by the law, not derived from any dictator, but derived from the Congress. We remember that the former Senator from Michigan, Mr. Brown, discussed the bill, and we must stand by that program. We cannot shoot it down without shooting down the whole

structure of our country and plunging our economy and our people into chaos.

Mr. President, so we have two great factors, and I say about the last one that there are merchants and manufacturers who complain about the ceilings. They complain that the ceilings are too low, and they complain about the regulations, that they are too many, or that they are too drastic. Perhaps they are for peacetime. Let us agree that our Government officials have sent out too many questionnaires. We must have ceilings, and we must have officials to impose them, and we must have officials to stand up for them, and we must have Senators who will stand up for those who do stand up for them. We cannot go along arguing and quarreling through a period such as this.

Mr. President, I am in favor of standing by the program, and I am not for weeping on the necks of my constituents. When they write complaining letters I do not complain back to them. There might be circumstances under which I would do so. It is a very fine thing to sympathize with complaints.

Hear me, Senators. We have reached the hour when we as Senators must stand up for the country. We must tell our constituents that we are in this war and that the American people must undergo its disciplines. If they do not undergo them voluntarily the time will come when they will thank God for some one who compelled them to do so.

Mr. President, this is total war. I was reading today that the Russian Army which whipped Napoleon was composed of 200,000 men. The present Russian Army is composed of 8,000,000 or 9,000,000 men and it is struggling with the Germans. We ourselves are planning for an armed force of fully 11,000,000 men. All the population must stand by in the matter of manpower, the matter of production, the matter of sacrifice, and the matter of discipline, and hold its peace. Let us quit the miserable quarrels. Let us quit the light and airy joke about the situation, and realize that this is not a matter which involves any political party. It is not a matter which involves the political life of any man. We have reached the stage in which the whole American people must rise to the high levels of sacrifice and self-discipline.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] spoke a short while ago about government by law or government by Executive order. He was praying against government by Executive order. I will pray with him. But if we want to maintain government by law in the United States of America through the present situation the Congress must be equal, as a lawmaking body, to sustaining the processes of the disciplining of 130,000,000 democrats. I mean that in the generic sense and not in the party sense. We are used to having our way. We are used to obtaining a favor. We are accustomed to having the Government do our will. The time has come when we must become accustomed once in a lifetime to doing the will of the Government, and not to complain, and not to hesitate, and not to tarry.

Mr. President, we can make some progress by keeping alert; we can make some criticism which may be helpful; but we cannot stir this Republic with the fires of discontent and dissatisfaction in a situation such as now faces us and hope to get through.

We have another remedy for our inflation, another effort to control it, and that is the program of impoverishment by taxation—that is the proper word for it, too. It is not taxation for revenue. I think the present tax structure calls for approximately twenty-one or twenty-two billions of dollars, and I understand that the one which is proposed is to call for sixteen billion more. While the Government needs the revenue, the authorities do not hesitate to say to us that one of the objectives of the heavy taxation is to recapture and absorb the excess money in the market, to extinguish the buying power of the people. I hope we may not come to that, but come to it we will unless we arrest this competition or counterirritation as between wages to the workers on the one hand and prices to the farmers on the other. It is a gun behind the door. It is a control to which we must have recourse if nothing else will avail.

I am thinking that we have toyed with this program since October, we have debated about it to suit ourselves, we have complained and criticized. We have sympathized with our constituents and, I think, have encouraged the American people to believe that they might escape the disciplines of the situation, that we may have the war without having its horrors, that we may have the war economy and still have a good time with ourselves and with our money. But the hour has come when we must straighten up—not merely the Members of the Senate but the whole American people—and must prove ourselves equal to the disciplines entailed by circumstances. The very first thing we have got to do is to learn how to cooperate with the National Government and the national policies—all of us, Republicans and Democrats, farmers and workers, and everyone else. We have got to maintain this program, as I have just said, whatever the cost. We cannot retreat. We cannot give away here and recover there. We have laid down our line. We have erected our fortifications. We have established our controls. We cannot run away from them; and the last body in the world to run is the Senate of the United States.

I think I have something to say about that. Senators are leaders of the people in their States, whether they would so classify themselves or not. The people are looking to us. They do not know what to do; they do not know what to think. We may not be political leaders; we may not be political bosses; and we may not be able to have our way; but we are Senators. When the people in their homes all over the country begin to think about what is going on and about what to do, they are thinking in terms of the men whom they elected to represent them here. We cannot afford to give out an uncertain sound. If the

watchmen on the tower give forth an uncertain sound, what shall the people say, and what shall the people do?

So, Mr. President, in this policy of cooperation we have got to give the American people a leadership in accepting the disciplines and controls demanded by the situation into which fate has cast us.

Now I come to the President's message. I shall be rather brief about it, I hope. When I first read the message it occurred to me as being the most earnest and one of the most important of all the President's messages to the Congress, and I lingered on the words. Here are his first words:

I am compelled to this action—

To this veto. Those are the words of the mighty man who is President, the man of whom so many of us are afraid lest he become a dictator. That is the leader of the Nation speaking for the national interest, and with all the powers of the Presidency; but he is compelled. What compels him?

I am compelled to this action by the deep conviction that this measure is inflationary in character. It breaks down the barriers we have erected and which we must maintain in order to avoid all the disasters of inflation.

That is not a scarecrow. That is not a bogey. That is not a boy crying "Wolf, wolf!" That is the President of the United States saying that the bill—

Breaks down—

Does not tend to break down, but breaks down—

the barriers we have erected and which we must maintain in order to avoid all the disasters of inflation.

The President then says:

It is wholly inconsistent with our stabilization program—

Meaning to say that it shoots that program all to pieces, it undoes the acts we have been enacting here, it destroys the program—

and therefore, dangerous alike to our constructive farm policy and to our whole war effort.

I believe the President's farm policy has been constructive, and I think something might be said here in behalf of the President as a friend of the farmer. I heard the letters from the farm agencies read today.

I have been in the Senate 12 years, and have seen acts to aid agriculture passed—a great tide of them—year after year, beginning with the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which I opposed when it was brought up in 1933, and continuing to the present hour. I am here to bear witness that the President of the United States has supported all those acts; he has been responsible for the passage of most of them. I do not deny that the farm organizations are friends of the farmers. Of course they are. But I think the President of the United States is a better friend of the farmers of the United States than are all the farm leaders and all the farm organizations, and I think the record will so show.

I read further from the President's message:

In my message of September 7, 1942, I advised the Congress that "our entire effort to hold the cost of living at its present level is now being sapped and undermined by further increases in farm prices and in wages, and by an ever-continuing pressure on prices resulting from the rising purchasing power of our people." I requested the Congress "to pass legislation under which the President would be specifically authorized to stabilize the cost of living, including the price of all farm commodities."

We cannot stabilize anything in America until we have stabilized the cost of living. There is no use in having any debate about that. I am for stabilizing wages; but how can we go about stabilizing wages until we stabilize the cost of living of the wage earner? The two things should be considered together. If we fail to do the first, we open the door to attacks from a thousand directions.

I shall not go into the argument of the President. It is perfectly satisfactory to me. It appears that he was attacked because of his interpretation of parity. I think a full answer to that attack occurs in four or five paragraphs of the message. However, I shall pass that by. I come to one sentence:

I have referred to the legislative history—

The history of parity—

only because of some of the criticisms of my action. I know that some Members of the Congress differ with my interpretation of the law. I credit them with sincerity. I ask that they credit me with equal sincerity.

I think that is a fair proposition. Agreed that there is debate about the interpretation; give the President credit for good faith. Give him credit for an interpretation in the interest of stabilization, and do not override his veto on the ground that he usurped power or acted improperly. Read his own explanation and see how it is reconciled with the interpretations of the Congress.

I come to page 4 of the message.

There has been an increase in the cost of living since May 1942. This increase is due mainly to our failure to bring food costs under control. But the War Labor Board is resolutely adhering to the Little Steel formula which compensates labor, in its wage rates, for the increase in the cost of living which occurred between January 1, 1941, and May 1, 1942.

The Board believes that if the formula is broken now it will start an inevitable inflationary spiral that would ultimately cancel out whatever gains labor has made, and place an intolerable burden on widows and old folks with fixed incomes, and on teachers and unorganized workers in low-paid occupations.

It will become impossible to hold this line if the cost of living is still further increased—not from imperative war needs, but by the action of the Congress in departing from its declared policy to stabilize all prices and wages.

If by this bill you force an increase in the cost of the basic foodstuffs—

No one denies that the bill would bring about an increase in the cost of sugar;

no one denies that it would bring about an increase in the cost of flour; no one denies that it would bring about an increase, indirectly, in other costs.

If by this bill you force an increase in the cost of the basic foodstuffs, and as a result the National War Labor Board increases wages, no one can tell where increases will start or what those increased wages will ultimately cost the farmers and all people of the Nation.

The President is dealing directly with the menace of inflation because of the failure of Congress and the country to recognize the necessity for stabilization.

Notice the last paragraph from the President's message. It begins in an odd way:

I appeal—

The President appeals, upon considerations duly set forth, to the considered judgment of the Congress to reject the Bankhead bill.

I appeal to the considered judgment of the Congress to reject the Bankhead bill which I am returning unsigned. It will not help the farmer with his immediate war difficulties. It will make it infinitely harder for the farmer to protect himself from wartime inflation and post-war chaos. It will add to the burdens of those most heavily burdened. It will make the winning of the war more difficult and gravely imperil our chances of winning the peace.

That is the judgment of the President, and that is the appeal of the President of the United States to the Congress. I do not think he has ever said anything to us of more solemn import than what he says in the last paragraph of his message. I reecho that appeal.

Ordinarily, and in time of peace, I might, with some lightness of heart, consider overriding a Presidential veto. I might simply say, "That is his judgment; this is mine, and I shall exercise mine." But even so, I should remember that the President was given the veto power in order that he might speak to me in the national interest, and I think I would hesitate. But in time of war, when he sends a bill back to us unsigned and appeals to us, in the name of winning the war, in the name of the welfare of the farmers, and in the name of winning the peace—when he makes an appeal such as that, I would have to have an overwhelming conviction, and an exceedingly great weight of evidence even to suggest to me that I override his veto.

In conclusion, if the Congress fails to bring about stabilization now, if the Congress now yields the line which we have erected, if the Congress now hesitates, if the Congress now waivers in sustaining the policy of stabilization, fully warned by the President and fully informed by events, we must take the responsibility for the consequences. As Abraham Lincoln said, "We shall not be able to escape history."

After this veto message and this warning, if we vote to override the veto, if we neglect to maintain control, and inflation comes, with chaos and disaster, history

will lay the accusation at our feet and not at his.

Mr. President, our situation in this country is very good in many respects. I am inclined to think that the farmers have done and will do their part. I am not among those who say that unless we do this or that for them they will not produce. I have watched them for more than 60 years. They go forth in seed time and harvest, in the early and the latter rains, and bring home the wealth to feed themselves and their country.

I am not so much inclined to complain of the workers. I know there are excrescences, delinquencies, and bad aspects. But after all, measured by the miraculous production of the last 2 years, the workers have done quite well, and are doing better today.

Nor am I inclined to complain of the industrialists. The way in which they have gone about putting their capital, their energies, and their plants into war production is something to hearten every American. We owe it to those classes to do our duty, to maintain them, and to stabilize them. They cannot carry on if we shake the foundations under them.

With regard to our sons, there were people who said we had a softened and careless generation and that our young men—and, I may add, our young women—would not be equal to the ordeals of such a time as this. But we now know better. A million and a half are abroad, and probably 4,000,000 are in camps in this country, and millions more will follow. They are fine, manly, valiant fellows. Women are working in the factories and helping the men who are engaged in the various activities.

Of our soldiers and sailors overseas there are stories of Homeric heroism coming home to us every day. We read of those things, and we read of our young men doing just as well as the ancients in the great traditions of Roman and Greek literature. We have a right to be proud. We have a right to be grateful. We have a right to be courageous.

Mr. President, we also have an obligation. We must maintain this country back of our people in the armed services. We must maintain this country equal to them. We must maintain it solidly behind them, and maintain its competence to sustain them. We must move the whole country up to higher levels of discipline and self-sacrifice and eliminate selfishness, just as they have done.

Mr. President, the other night I read some lines written by a British poet by the name of Alfred Noyes. He lived during the First World War. He had attended a memorial service for British sailors held in Trinity Church in New York. He left the church undertaking to interpret his heart, his emotions, his duty, and his obligations.

Mr. President, we have our sailors and our soldiers. They are going forth by the hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, to fill graves in other lands. We must measure our duty as we measure

theirs for them, and as they measure theirs for themselves.

I read what the poet Noyes wrote on the occasion to which I have referred:

There's but one gift that all our dead desire,
One gift that men can give, and that's a dream,

Unless we, too, can burn with that same fire
Of sacrifice; die to the things that seem.

Die to the little hatreds, die to greed;

Die to the old ignoble selves we knew;

Die to the base contempts of sect and creed,
And rise again, like these, with souls as true.

Nay, since these died before their task was finished,

Attempt new heights, bring even their dreams to birth;

Build us that better world, oh, not diminished
By one true splendor that they planned on earth.

And that's not done by sword, or tongue, or pen,

There's but one way: God make us better men.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I stated a few days ago that in my judgment the purposes and the issues involved in the bill, as well as the effect of the bill, have been misunderstood in some quarters. After further consideration, and after discussion with friends on the floor, I am convinced that more time should be given to appraise the situation, and allow Members of the Senate to better understand the issues, as well as the consequence of passing the bill over the President's veto. Recognizing that many factors are involved, and after consultation with associates and friends on both sides of the issue, I have decided to move that the bill, with the accompanying papers, be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Alabama to refer the bill with the accompanying papers to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BARKLEY. The motion is debatable. It is obvious that we cannot dispose of it today. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Alabama and other Senators, I should like to have the Senate suspend until tomorrow. Would that be agreeable?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have no desire to resist the procedure suggested by the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is now 5 o'clock, and there will be some discussion of the motion of the Senator from Alabama, and I doubt that it would be proper to ask Senators to remain to vote tonight. Therefore, within a few minutes it will be my purpose to move that the Senate recess until tomorrow.

CHILD-CARE MAINTENANCE UNDER LANHAM ACT

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, about 2 weeks ago a very great deal of discussion took place on the floor of the Senate concerning the use of Lanham

Act funds and applications being made for child-care centers and development of facilities for such purposes.

I took the matter up with the Federal Works Agency, with the request that General Fleming advise me so as to remove much of the confusion which seems to surround our thinking on the subject. He has brought us down to date in a splendid letter which I have received from him. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
Washington, March 25, 1943.

Hon. JOHN A. DANAHER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DANAHER: Responsive to your letter of March 18, I am glad to pass along certain data in which you have expressed interest relative to the activity of the Federal Works Agency in helping to meet the urgent need for supervisory care of school age or preschool age children of mothers who are filling or are about to fill jobs essential to the winning of the war.

All of us know that the employment of women workers is increasing in most war plants. Although there is a definite Federal policy against the recruiting of mothers of young children, a considerable number of such mothers are working. There are also working a very much larger number of mothers whose children are somewhat older but still in need of care. Quite apart from an understandable patriotic impulse to make some definite contribution to the war effort, many mothers have been impelled by economic considerations to take war jobs. This is especially true of the wives of soldiers whose allotments have been insufficient to meet family needs. Then too, from the standpoint of the employer, it has been found necessary in some crowded war industry areas to hire mothers even of small children because inadequate transportation and housing facilities have made it infeasible to bring in workers from the outside. A large proportion of these women workers are mothers of children from 2 years of age up to the age of 14. It is clearly necessary to make provision for the care of these children while their mothers are at work. Many communities are trying to provide facilities to meet this need.

Inevitably problems of financing arise. Some of the war-working mothers are earning wages above the average earned by women in peacetime. On the other hand, many earn only the minimum prescribed by the wage-and-hour or public-contracts laws, and are able to pay only a part of the cost for day care of their children. Similarly the resources of the communities are modest, and often strained. The Federal Works Agency is meeting these needs through strictly limited contributions to eligible applicants from Lanham Act funds to the extent that such funds are available. As you are aware, the Lanham Act expires 6 months after the emergency.

As of March 20, 1943, 29,800 children in war-affected communities had been provided for through nursery schools or extended school services aided by Lanham Act funds. Applications were pending for the care of 80,220 additional children in war-affected communities. Including applica-

tions approved and pending, a total of 110,020 children in war-affected communities shortly will be cared for with the assistance of Lanham Act funds. Of this total, approximately half are being cared for by nursery schools and the other half by centers for the care of school children from 6 to 14 before and after classes, while their mothers are at work. A total of \$2,451,438 in Federal funds thus far has been approved by the President for the purpose. This sum will be increased, of course, as projects still pending are approved.

Applications may be made for Lanham Act funds for group services for children from 2 to 14 years old. Required to accompany all applications is a statement with supporting data showing the war needs for the activities for which funds are requested. Corroboration is obtained from employers. Before funds are granted a certificate of need is required from other Federal agencies, more especially from the United States Office of Education. Of 142 applications for nursery schools pending March 20 in the office of the Federal Works Agency, 126 were awaiting certificates of necessity from the Office of Education.

The applicant is responsible for the selection of children to whom the services shall be given. It is well understood, however, that services should be limited to children of working mothers. Enrollment is not limited to the children of parents working in any given plant. Employment in civilian trades and services and in agriculture, as well as in war factories, is considered an essential contribution to the war effort. Special justification is required from applicants for the care of other children, such as those living in trailers or migratory camps. Applicants must be public agencies, such as boards of education and welfare bodies, or such nonprofit private organizations as can show legal authority to operate the service requested.

The total amount of fees collected from parents plus other local contributions must be sufficient to defray at least 50 percent of the current operating costs of the program.

On January 1, 1943, there were approximately 1,500 Work Projects Administration nursery schools. Operation of these facilities by the Work Projects Administration will cease on or before April 30, 1943. Applications have been approved or are pending through which local communities will take over, with Federal Works Agency assistance under the Lanham Act, the majority of those—but only of those—which are meeting a war need. Since in the greater proportion of communities there is no local budgetary provision for this type of service the only presently established means of financing them is through local contributions of buildings, facilities, or services, fees to be collected from parents and Lanham Act funds.

Attached is a recapitulation of Lanham Act applications for child-care maintenance and operation facilities as of March 20, 1943, together with a list of locations of Lanham Act nursery schools and school services as of March 12, 1943. Some of the projects on this list have since been approved by the President.

If I can be helpful in clarifying any other points regarding the operation of the Federal Works Agency child-care program, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Major General, United States Army,
Administrator.

Status of Lanham applications for wartime school facilities (maintenance and operation of child-care facilities), Mar. 20, 1943

	Number of units	Number of children	Number of applications
Approved by the President:			
Nursery schools.....	475	16,315	79
Extended school services.....	251	13,485	143
Total.....	726	29,800	80
Pending: ²			
Nursery schools.....	934	38,590	142
Extended school services.....	564	41,630	170
Total (of this total, 126 are awaiting certificate of necessity from the U. S. Office of Education).....	1,498	80,220	145
Totals:			
Nursery schools.....	1,409	54,905	221
Extended school services.....	815	55,115	118
Grand total.....	2,224	110,020	225

Federal funds approved by the President, \$2,451,438

¹ Application for extended school services is usually included in the application for nursery schools. To date there are only 4 separate applications for such services.

² Includes applications being reviewed in Washington, awaiting Board review, and awaiting certificate of necessity.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Marine Corps (and withdrawing several other nominations), which nominating message was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received and nominations withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward M. Connelly, of Washington, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington, vice Lyle D. Keith, resigned;

Charles W. Robertson, of South Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of South Dakota;

George Philip, of South Dakota, to be United States attorney for the district of South Dakota;

Edmund J. Brandon, of Massachusetts, to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts; and

Irving J. Higbee, of New York, to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York, vice Ralph L. Emmons, term expired.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Clarence Mullins, of Alabama, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama; new position.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Fannie Dixon Welch, of Columbia, Conn., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn. (reappointment).

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Stanley N. Bailey, from the State of California, to be assistant area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the San Francisco area office of the War Manpower Commission;

James P. Blaisdell, from the State of California, to be area director, at \$6,500 per annum, in the San Francisco area office of the War Manpower Commission;

William Royle, from the State of Nevada, to be area director for Nevada, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Reno office of the War Manpower Commission;

Alexander C. Martin, Jr., from the State of Texas, to be principal manpower utilization consultant at \$5,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Orland V. Steele, from the State of Washington, to be senior administrative officer, at \$4,600 per annum, in the San Francisco regional office of the War Manpower Commission; and

Walter L. Sundstrom, from the State of Washington, to be senior training specialist, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Seattle area office of the War Manpower Commission.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Osborne B. Hardison to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from November 29, 1942.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Public Health Service nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis S. Low to be rear admiral.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph R. Redman to be rear admiral.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Marine Corps nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE NOMINATIONS

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I inquire from what committee the Public Health Service nominations come.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that they come from the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TAFT. I have never seen any such nominations. I do not think there is anything very serious involved, but I do not remember any action by the Committee on Finance on several hundred Public Health Service nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has no further information on the matter.

Mr. TAFT. I was merely curious to find from what committee the United States Public Health Service nominations came. I do not remember any action by the Committee on Finance on these nominations. It is not stated on the calendar from what committee they come.

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot inform the Senator about it. They are on the calendar. I do not know when they were reported.

Mr. TAFT. I am a member of the Committee on Finance, and I do not remember any action by that committee on the nominations.

Mr. BARKLEY. I, too, am a member of the committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] reported the nominations.

EDWARD M. CONNELLY

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, there is on the clerk's desk at the moment the nomination of Mr. Edward M. Connelly to be United States district attorney for the eastern district of Washington. The nomination is not on the calendar, but it has been reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary, and I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be considered at this time and disposed of.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward M. Connelly to be United States district attorney for the eastern district of Washington.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified at once of all confirmations of today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be forthwith notified.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 7, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 6, 1943:

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS

William G. Winters, Jr., a citizen of Texas, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of May 1942.

George Wolly, a citizen of Florida, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 13th day of June 1942.

John R. Napton, Jr., a citizen of Mississippi, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of August 1942.

Francis J. O'Connor, Jr., a citizen of New Jersey, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1942.

Kenneth H. Sayre, a citizen of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of December 1942.

Platoon Sgt. George W. King, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 10th day of February 1943.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate April 6, 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Reuben B. Resnik, to be field supervisor in the Dallas regional office.

George P. Williams, to be senior housing and transportation specialist in the Atlanta regional office.

George W. Caylor, to be senior manpower utilization consultant in the New York regional office.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 6, 1943:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Edward M. Connelly to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be temporary medical directors from April 1, 1943:

Richard B. Holt	Frank V. Meriwether
Calvin C. Applewhite	Winfield K. Sharp, Jr.
Lynne A. Fullerton	
William Y. Hollingsworth	

To be temporary senior surgeons from April 1, 1943:

Alfred J. Arelmayer	George G. Holdt
George W. Folin	Ernest E. Huber
Edwin H. Carnes	Gerald M. Kunkel
James A. Crabtree	John R. Murdock
Joseph O. Dean	William W. Nesbit
Warren P. Dearing	Edgar W. Norris
Alexander G. Gilliam	Robert H. Onstott
Ralph Gregg	Edward R. Pelikan
Victor H. Haas	Adolph S. Rumreich
Franklin J. Halpin	James B. Ryon
Claude D. Head, Jr.	Mark P. Schultz

William H. Sebrell, Jr.
Homer L. Skinner
Calvin B. Spencer
Fletcher C. Stewart

To be temporary surgeons from April 1, 1943:

James C. Archer
Richard C. Arnold
Llewellyn L. Ashburn
Theodore J. Bauer
Fred J. Black
Bert R. Boone
Frederick J. Brady
Ralph R. Braund
Lawrence W. Brown
Leroy E. Burney
Roy E. Butler
Don S. Cameron
John W. Cronin
Dorland J. Davis
Thomas R. Dawber
Austin V. Deibert
Anthony Donovan
Virgil J. Dorset
John E. Dunn
Harry Eagle
David C. Elliott
Robert H. Felix
Howard D. Fishburn
Robert H. Flinn
Havelock F. Fraser
Michael L. Furcolow
Edward B. Gall
Kenneth E. Gamm
Alfred B. Geyer
Eugene A. Gillis
William H. Gordon
James A. Grider, Jr.
Robert L. Griffith
Leland J. Hanchett
Floyd A. Hawk
Roger E. Heering
John R. Heller, Jr.
Clifton K. Himmelsbach
Henry A. Holle
John B. Holt
John W. Hornbrook
George H. Hunt
Benjamin F. Jones
Marion K. King
Harry C. Knight
Harold L. Lawrence

To be temporary senior dental surgeons from April 1, 1943:

David Cooper
Frederick W. Harper

To be temporary dental surgeons from April 1, 1943:

James O. Blythe, Jr.
Mark E. Bowers
William W. Calhoun, Jr.
Henry F. Canby
Edward J. Driscoll
Joseph J. Dunlay
Leonard R. Etzenhouser
Bruce D. Forsyth
John M. Francis
Donald J. Galagan
Charles B. Galt

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons from April 1, 1943:

Frederick K. Albrecht
William S. Baum
Buell B. Bindschedler
William G. Budington
Wayne W. Carpenter
Nunzio J. Carozzo
Michael J. Clarke
Bruce Cominole
John C. Cutler
Selwyn H. Drummond
Henry D. Ecker
George F. Ellinger

Joseph F. Van Ackeren
Gregory J. Van Beeck
Langdon R. White

Bencon O. Lewis
Albert G. Love, Jr.
Robert K. Maddock
Charles R. Mallary
Hollis U. Maness
Ralph W. McComas
John R. McGibony
Thorburn S. McGowan

Thomas B. McKneely
Charles T. Meacham, Jr.

Seward E. Miller
Ralph J. Mitchell
Edgar W. Moreland
Ward L. Mould
Marion B. Noyes
John W. Oliphant
Carroll E. Palmer
Donald W. Patrick
Jonathan B. Peebles, Jr.

Michael J. Pescor
Arthur B. Price
Thurman H. Rose
Leonard A. Scheele
Walter E. Sharpe, Jr.
Leslie McC. Smith
Wilson T. Sowder
Charles G. Spicknall
James G. Teifer
Thomas H. Tomlinson, Jr.

George G. Van Dyke
Seymour D. Vestermark
Victor H. Vogel
Paul E. Walker
James Watt
Waldemar J. A. Wickman

Oliver C. Williams
John L. Wilson
William G. Workman
John T. Wright
Francis T. Zinn
Jonathan Zoole

Joseph A. Moore
Douglas S. Nisbet
Raymond S. Roy
Albert N. Sarwold
David W. Scott, Jr.
Richard C. Siders
James A. Smith

To be temporary passed assistant dental surgeons from April 1, 1943:

Vernon J. Forney

To be temporary pharmacists from April 1, 1943:

Thomas C. Armstrong
Raymond D. Kinsey

To be temporary senior sanitary engineers from April 1, 1943:

Henry A. Johnson

To be temporary sanitary engineers from April 1, 1943:

Allen D. Brandt
Mark D. Hollis
Vincent B. Lamoureux

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Francis S. Low to be rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from July 27, 1942.

Joseph R. Redman to be rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from July 1, 1942.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Clyde A. Brooks
Maxie R. Williams
Harry O. Buzhardt
John C. Lundrigan
Houston Stiff
John C. Sheffield, Jr.
William P. Oliver
John Lovell
William M. Graham, Jr.

William P. Nesbit
Roland H. Makowski
Edward H. Greason
Andrew Andeck
James P. Young, Jr.
Albert F. Topham
William H. Clark
Harry L. Givens, Jr.
William E. Maiser
Horace C. Reifel

POSTMASTERS

MISSISSIPPI

Roy Scott Barber, Lake Cormorant.
Alice L. Robertson, Pope.
James Vertner Gage, Port Gibson.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 6, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

How manifold are Thy mercies, our Heavenly Father, upon earth. We praise Thee for a Saviour who died on a cross that love had stricken bare. We pray that we may humble ourselves and be lifted into the upper air of spiritual aspiration; allow not temptation to befall us nor to weaken or wither our powers. Send us forth today with broader thoughts and nobler qualities to build into the circles of life that men may love and honor our country; this is possible only with a new heart and right spirit as lived by good parents, obedient children, just masters, and honest servants.

Blessed Lord, time is priceless, and we pray that we may unite our powers so that our supreme passion shall be our country, forever one and inseparable. Send Thy benediction upon every heart

so that youth and age shall be free to walk the lanes and streets of this world. Merciful Father, in this time of woe and anguish reconcile us to assume our urgent responsibility to take our full share in dethroning the hierarchies of inhumanity; give us that peace which nothing can out-weary because our minds are stayed on Thee. In the name of Thy well-beloved Son. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD excerpts from 11 memorials and resolutions just received as being passed by the Montana Legislature. I am not inserting the memorials themselves. I am taking out the gravamen of these memorials and resolutions and asking to insert them in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 20 minutes on Tuesday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two editorials from my district on the Ruml plan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SHAFER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects and to include an editorial in each.